arXiv:1210.1373v1 [math.AP] 4 Oct 2012

Morse indices of multiple blow-up solutions to the two-dimensional Gel’fand problem

Francesca Gladiali Massimo Grossi Hiroshi Ohtsuka
Takashi Suzuki

October 3, 2012

Abstract

Blow-up solutions to the two-dimensional Gel’fand problem are studied. It is known that the location of the blow-up points of these solutions is related to a Hamiltonian function involving the Green function of the domain. We show that this implies an equivalence between the Morse indices of the solutions and the associated criticalpoints of the Hamiltonian.

Keywords. Gel’fand problem, Hamiltonian, Morse index

1 Introduction

The purpose of the present paper is to study the Gel’fand problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = \lambda e^u & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$ and $\lambda > 0$ is a parameter. This problem is associated with several phenomena in differential geometry, turbulence theory, and gauge field theory (see [S08] and the references therein.)

F. Gladiali: Università degli Studi di Sassari,via Piandanna 4 -07100 Sassari, Italy;
e-mail: fgladiali@uniss.it

M. Grossi: Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Roma “La Sapienza”, P.le A. Moro 2 - 00185 Roma, Italy; e-mail: grossi@mat.uniroma1.it

H. Ohtsuka (Corresponding author): Department of Applied Physics, Faculty of Engineering, University of Miyazaki, Gakuen Kibanadai Nishi 1-1, Miyazakishi, 889-2192, Japan; e-mail: ohtsuka@cc.miyazaki-u.ac.jp

T. Suzuki: Division of Mathematical Science, Department of System Innovation, Graduate School of Engineering Science, Osaka University, Machikaneyamacho 1-3, Toyonakashi 560-8531, Japan;
e-mail: suzuki@sigmath.es.osaka-u.ac.jp

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): Primary 35P30; Secondary 35B40

Let $\mathcal{C} = \{(\lambda, u) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times C(\Omega) \mid (1.1)$ is satisfied$\}$ be the solutions set. The first observation is that $\mathcal{C} = \emptyset$ for λ large enough. The next one is that $\mathcal{C} \cap \{\lambda \geq \varepsilon\}$ is compact in $\mathbf{R} \times C(\overline{\Omega})$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and then there are at least two solutions for each $0 < \lambda \ll 1$ (see [CR75] for this fact and also [CL01] for more detailed construction of the solutions).

The structure of $\mathcal{C}$, however, is much richer according to the topological and geometrical properties of the domain Ω (see [EGP05] ,[DKM05] and [SU92]), which provides significant effects to the above mentioned geometric and physical theories. Critical phenomena in fact occur to the solution $u = u(x)$ as $\lambda \downarrow 0$. This profile is described by [NS90] as a quantized blow-up mechanism.

Let $\{\lambda_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of positive values such that $\lambda_n \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ and let $u_n = u_n(x)$ be a sequence of solutions of (1.1) for $\lambda = \lambda_n$. In [NS90], the authors proved the total mass quantization, that is,

$$\lambda_n \int_\Omega e^{u_n}\, dx \to 8\pi m \tag{1.2}$$

for some $m = 0, 1, 2, \cdots, +\infty$ along a sub-sequence.
If $m = 0$ the pair $(\lambda_n, u_{\lambda_n}) \in \mathcal{C}$ converges to $(0, 0)$ as $\lambda_n \to 0$.
If $m = +\infty$ there arises the entire blow-up of the solution u_n, in the sense that $\inf_K u_n \to +\infty$ for any $K \Subset \Omega$.
If $0 < m < \infty$ the solutions $\{u_n\}$ blow-up at m-points. Thus there is a set $\mathcal{S} = \{\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m\} \subset \Omega$ of m distinct points such that $\|u_n\|_{L^\infty(\omega)} = O(1)$ for any $\omega \Subset \overline{\Omega} \setminus \mathcal{S}$,

$$u_n|_{\mathcal{S}} \to +\infty \quad \text{as } n \to \infty,$$

and

$$u_n \to \sum_{j=1}^m 8\pi\, G(\cdot, \kappa_j) \quad \text{in } C^2_{loc}(\overline{\Omega} \setminus \mathcal{S}). \tag{1.3}$$

Here and henceforth, $G(x, y)$ denotes the Green function of $-\Delta$ in Ω with Dirichlet boundary condition. The Robin function $R(x) = K(x, x)$ is now defined by the regular part of $G(x, y)$ denoted by $K = K(x, y)$, i.e.,

$$G(x, y) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \log |x - y|^{-1} + K(x, y). \tag{1.4}$$

Then the blow-up points satisfy,

$$\nabla H^m(\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_m) = 0 \tag{1.5}$$

where

$$H^m(x_1, \ldots, x_m) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^m R(x_j) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{1\leq j,h\leq m \\ j\neq h}} G(x_j, x_h).$$

See also [MW01] for relating facts.

If the critical point $(\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_m)$ of H^m is non-degenerate, then it generates a family of solutions $\{u_\lambda\}_\lambda$ to (1.1) satisfying (1.2) as $\lambda \downarrow 0$ (see [BP98]). Moreover the non-degeneracy of $(\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_m)$ implies that of u_λ for $0 < \lambda \ll 1$. This was proven first for $m = 1$ by [GG04] and then by [GOS11] for the general case. The purpose of this paper is to know more about this correspondence between the solution u_λ and the associated critical point $(\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_m)$ of H^m up to the Morse indices of the both (see Remark 1.4 and Remark 1.5 for a more detailed motivation).

To state our results, we take a sequence of solutions $\{u_n\}$ to (1.1) for $\lambda = \lambda_n$ satisfying $\lambda_n \downarrow 0$ and (1.2). Since $m = 1$ was studied in [GG09] we shall assume $m \geq 2$ in the sequel. Then we consider the eigenvalue problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v_n^k = \mu_n^k \lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n^k & \text{in } \Omega \\ \|v_n^k\|_\infty = \max_{\overline{\Omega}} v_n^k = 1 & \\ v_n^k = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

which admits a sequence of eigenvalues $\mu_n^1 < \mu_n^2 \leq \mu_n^3 \leq \ldots$, where v_n^k is the k-th eigenfunction of (1.6) corresponding to the eigenvalue μ_n^k. The Morse and augmented Morse index of u_n, denoted by $\mathrm{ind}_M(u_n)$ and $\mathrm{ind}_M^*(u_n)$, respectively, are defined by

$$\mathrm{ind}_M(u_n) = \#\{k \in \mathbb{N}\,;\, \mu_n^k < 1\}, \quad \mathrm{ind}_M^*(u_n) = \#\{k \in \mathbb{N}\,;\, \mu_n^k \leq 1\}.$$

Given a C^2-function f of 2m-variables

$$(x_1, \cdots, x_m) = (x_{1,1}, x_{1,2}, \cdots, x_{m,1}, x_{m,2}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2m},$$

and its critical point $(\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m) \in \mathbb{R}^{2m}$, the Morse and augmented Morse index of f at $(\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m)$ are denoted by $\mathrm{ind}_M f(\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m)$ and $\mathrm{ind}_M^* f(\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m)$, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{ind}_M f(\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m) &= \#\{k \in \mathbb{N}\,;\, \Lambda^k < 0\}, \\ \mathrm{ind}_M^* f(\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m) &= \#\{k \in \mathbb{N}\,;\, \Lambda^k \leq 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\Lambda^1 \leq \Lambda^2 \leq \cdots \leq \Lambda^{2m}$ are the eigenvalues of the Hessian matrix $\mathrm{Hess} f = \left(\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_{i,\alpha} \partial x_{j,\beta}}\right)$ at $(\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m)$, with $i, j = 1, .., m$ and $\alpha, \beta = 1, 2$.

Under these notations we can state our main result.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that* $\{u_n\}$ *is a sequence of solutions to* (1.1) *which blows-up at* $\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m \in \Omega$. *Then its Morse index* $\mathrm{ind}_M(u_n)$ *and the augmented Morse index* $\mathrm{ind}_M^*(u_n)$ *satisfy the following estimates for* n *large,*

$$m + \mathrm{ind}_M\{-H^m(\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m)\} \leq \mathrm{ind}_M(u_n), \tag{1.7}$$

$$\mathrm{ind}_M^*(u_n) \leq m + \mathrm{ind}_M^*\{-H^m(\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m)\}. \tag{1.8}$$

If $(\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m)$ *is a non-degenerate critical point of* H^m*, it holds that* $\mathrm{ind}_M H^m(\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m) = \mathrm{ind}^*_M H^m(\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m)$*, and hence*

$$\mathrm{ind}_M(u_n) = m + \mathrm{ind}_M\{-H^m(\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m)\}.$$

From the proof of Theorem 1.1 described above, we always have $m \le \mathrm{ind}_M(u_n) \le \mathrm{ind}^*_M(u_n) \le 3m$. A direct proof of the first inequality, $m \le \mathrm{ind}_M(u_n)$, is given in [FT].

The previous result is a consequence of a delicate asymptotic expansion of the first $3m+1$ eigenvalues. This result, contained in the next theorem, is interesting in itself.

Theorem 1.2. *We have that, for* $\lambda_n \to 0$*,*

$$\mu_n^k = -\frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{\log \lambda_n} + o\left(\frac{1}{\log \lambda_n}\right) \quad \text{for } 1 \le k \le m, \tag{1.9}$$

$$\mu_n^k = 1 - 48\pi\eta^{2m-(k-m)+1}\lambda_n + o\left(\lambda_n\right) \quad \text{for } m+1 \le k \le 3m, \tag{1.10}$$

and

$$\mu_n^k > 1 \quad \text{for } k \ge 3m+1 \tag{1.11}$$

where η^k $(k = 1, \cdots, 2m)$ *is the* k*-th eigenvalue of the matrix* $D(\mathrm{Hess}H^m)D$ *at* $(\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m)$*. Here* $D = (D_{ij})$ *is the diagonal matrix* $\mathrm{diag}[d_1, d_1, d_2, d_2, \cdots, d_m, d_m]$ *(see* (2.3) *for the definition of the constants* d_j*).*

Theorem 1.2 involves delicate computations. One of the crucial point is to localize u_n and its partial derivatives around the blowup points $\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m$. Actually, we will use them as test functions to estimate the first $3m+1$ eigenvalues.

Remark 1.3. An analogous result to Theorem 1.1 has been proved in [BYR95] for positive solutions of the problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = u^{\frac{N+2}{N-2}-\epsilon} & \text{in } \Omega \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.12}$$

where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a smooth bounded domain, $N \ge 4$ and ϵ is small enough. However, the approach used in [BYR95] is quite different from ours and it does not provide the estimates of Theorem 1.2. Similar estimates to (1.9)-(1.11) for the problem (1.12) was obtained in [GP05].

Remark 1.4. We note that $H^m = H^m(x_1, \ldots, x_m)$ appears as the Hamiltonian in the point vortex theory of Onsager [O49]. In this theory the vortex system

$$\frac{dx_i}{dt} = \nabla^\perp H^m(x_1, \ldots, x_m), \quad i = 1, \ldots, m \tag{1.13}$$

is used to describe the motion of point vortices $\omega(dx,t)=\sum_{i=1}^{N}\delta_{x_i(t)}(dx)$ of perfect fluid in a two dimensional space. Then the Gel'fand problem (1.1) arises as a high-energy limit as $N\to\infty$ in (1.13) under the factorization property, sometimes called the propagation of chaos [JM73, PL76, ES93]. We thus regard (1.13) as a Hamilton system to take the canonical measure by a thermodynamical relation (see [CLMP92, CLMP95, K93, SU92] for more rigorous approach and related mathematical results).

Remark 1.5. At this stage it may be worth mentioning of [GT10], where the authors proved that if Ω is convex only $m=1$ is admitted and H^1 has only one critical point. However, bifurcation of critical points of H^m may occur if we perturb the domain into a non-convex one, which implies the existence of the singular limits with $m>1$ as $\lambda\to 0$ (see, e.g., [MS97], [CCL03], [EGP05], and [DKM05]). In the generic case, these critical points of H^m after bifurcation are non-degenerate and hence the associated singular limits generate non-degenerate classical solutions to (1.1) for λ small as we mentioned before. Therefore it may be natural to ask whether the change of Morse indices of the solutions $\{u_\lambda\}$ follows from the bifurcation of the critical point of H^m or not. The conclusion of the present paper supports this delicate property.

The quantized blowup mechanism (1.2) induces the invariance of the total degree of the set of solutions to the mean field equation in dis-quantized intervals of the parameter, and the degree is related to the genus of Ω (see [CL03]). In this paper we are concentrated on the Gel'fand problem (1.1), although similar correspondences between the Morse index of the solution and the Hamiltonian are suspected for the mean field equation, too. Our analysis here uses Y.Y. Li's estimate [Li99] (see [L07] for an alternative proof).

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains some preliminaries and some estimates on the the eigenvalues μ_n when $\mu_n\longrightarrow 0$ and $\mu_n\longrightarrow 1$ which will use in the next sections. In Section 3 we show the main estimates on the eigenvalues. In Section 4 we prove Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. In the appendix we show several elementary facts used in the paper.

2 Preliminaries and asymptotic estimates

2.1 The general case $\mu_n^k\ge 0$

In this section we show several properties on eigenvalues $\{\mu_n^k\}$ and eigenfunctions $\{v_n^k\}$ of (1.6) for any $k\ge 0$.

Take $0<R\ll 1$ satisfying $B_{2R}(\kappa_i)\Subset\Omega$ for $i=1,\dots,m$ and $B_R(\kappa_i)\cap B_R(\kappa_j)=\emptyset$ if $i\neq j$. For each $\kappa_j\in\mathcal{S}$, $j=1,\dots,m$, there exists a sequence $\{x_{j,n}\}\in B_R(\kappa_j)$ such that

$i)$ $u_n(x_{j,n}) = \sup_{B_R(x_{j,n})} u_n(x) \to +\infty$,

$ii)$ $x_{j,n} \to \kappa_j$ as $n \to +\infty$.

Then we rescale u_n around $x_{j,n}$ as

$$\tilde{u}_{j,n}(\tilde{x}) := u_n\left(\delta_{j,n}\tilde{x} + x_{j,n}\right) - u_n(x_{j,n}) \quad \text{in } B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{j,n}}}(0) \tag{2.1}$$

where the scaling parameter $\delta_{j,n}$ is determined by

$$\lambda_n e^{u_n(x_{j,n})}\delta_{j,n}^2 = 1. \tag{2.2}$$

By [GOS11, Corollary 4.3] there exists a constant $d_j > 0$ such that

$$\delta_{j,n} = d_j\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + o\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \tag{2.3}$$

as $n \to \infty$ for a sub-sequence, and in particular, $\delta_{j,n} \longrightarrow 0$. Then relations (2.2) and (2.3) in turn give

$$u_n(x_{j,n}) = -2\log\lambda_n + O(1) \tag{2.4}$$

as $n \to \infty$ for any $j = 1, \dots, m$.

Remark 2.1. The above d_j is determined by the blow-up set $\mathcal{S}$. Actually it can be proved that

$$d_j = \frac{1}{8}\exp\left\{4\pi R(\kappa_j) + 4\pi \sum_{\substack{1\le i\le m\\ i\neq j}} G(\kappa_j, \kappa_i)\right\}. \tag{2.5}$$

The proof of (2.5) requires a weak form of sharper estimates due to [CL02].

The function $\tilde{u}_{j,n}$ in (2.1) satisfies

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\tilde{u}_{j,n} = e^{\tilde{u}_{j,n}} & \text{in } B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{j,n}}}(0) \\ \tilde{u}_{j,n} \le \tilde{u}_{j,n}(0) = 0 & \text{in } B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{j,n}}}(0) \end{cases}$$

and then a classification result (see [CL91]) implies

$$\tilde{u}_{j,n}(\tilde{x}) \to U(\tilde{x}) = \log\frac{1}{\left(1 + \frac{|\tilde{x}|^2}{8}\right)^2} \quad \text{in } C^\infty_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2). \tag{2.6}$$

Moreover (see [Li99]), it holds that

$$\left|\tilde{u}_{j,n}(\tilde{x}) - U(\tilde{x})\right| \le C, \quad \forall\tilde{x} \in B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{j,n}}}(0) \tag{2.7}$$

with a constant $C > 0$.

As we did for u_n, we rescale also the eigenfunctions v_n around $x_{j,n}$ using $\delta_{j,n}$ defined by (2.2), that is,

$$\tilde{v}_{j,n}(\tilde{x}) := v_n\left(\delta_{j,n}\tilde{x} + x_{j,n}\right) \quad \text{in } B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{j,n}}}(0). \tag{2.8}$$

Then it holds that

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta\tilde{v}_{j,n} = \mu_n e^{\tilde{u}_{j,n}}\tilde{v}_{j,n} & \text{in } B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{j,n}}}(0) \\ \|\tilde{v}_{j,n}\|_{L^\infty\left(B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{j,n}}}(0)\right)} \leq 1. \end{cases} \tag{2.9}$$

The following proposition follows from the standard elliptic theory.

Proposition 2.2. *Let* $\{\mu_n\}$ *be a sequence of eigenvalues of* (1.6) *satisfying*

$$\mu_n \longrightarrow \mu_\infty \in \mathbb{R}$$

as $n\longrightarrow\infty$*. Then there exist* $(V_1, \cdots, V_m) \in C^{2,\alpha}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2)^m$ *and a sub-sequence satisfying*

$$\tilde{v}_{j,n}\longrightarrow V_j \quad \textit{in } C^{2,\alpha}_{loc}\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right)$$

and

$$-\Delta V_j = \mu_\infty e^U V_j \quad \textit{in } \mathbb{R}^2, \quad \|V_j\|_{L^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right)} \leq 1. \tag{2.10}$$

Remark 2.3. Since it may happen that $V_j \equiv 0$ for any $j = 1, \dots, m$, from (2.10) we cannot derive that μ_∞ is an eigenvalue of

$$-\Delta V = \alpha e^U V \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2, \quad V \in L^\infty\left(\mathbb{R}^2\right). \tag{2.11}$$

Later we shall prove that $V_j \not\equiv 0$ for some $j \in \{1, \cdots, m\}$, and consequently, μ_∞ is actually an eigenvalue of (2.11).

The structure of the eigenvalue problem (2.11) is described in [GG09, Theorem 11.1]. All the eigenvalues are thus given as $\alpha_k = \frac{k(k+1)}{2}$ for $k = 0, 1, 2, \cdots$, with the multiplicity $2k+1$. To examine the Morse index of u_n, therefore, we need to study the cases $\mu_\infty = \alpha_0 = 0$ and $\mu_\infty = \alpha_1 = 1$.

Remark 2.4. We have that

$i)$ If $\mu_\infty = \alpha_0 = 0$ we have $V_j \equiv c_j$, where $c_j \in \mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}$ is a constant. Let $\mathfrak{c} = (c_1, \cdots, c_m)$.

$ii)$ If $\mu_\infty = \alpha_1 = 1$ there exists a vector $\boldsymbol{a}_j \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and a constant $b_j \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $(\boldsymbol{a}_j, b_j) \neq (\boldsymbol{0}, 0)$ and $V_j = \boldsymbol{a}_j \cdot \nabla U + b_j\overline{U}$, where $\overline{U} = \tilde{x}\cdot\nabla U + 2$. Let $\mathfrak{a} = (\boldsymbol{a}_1, \cdots, \boldsymbol{a}_m) \in \mathbb{R}^{2m}$ and $\mathfrak{b} = (b_1, \cdots, b_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m$.

In the next proposition we show the asymptotic profile of v_n in $\overline{\Omega}\backslash\{\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m\}$.

Proposition 2.5. *For $0 < R \ll 1$ it holds that*

$$\frac{v_n(x)}{\mu_n} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left\{ \gamma_{j,n}^0 G(x, x_{j,n}) + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{j,n}^{\mathbf{1}} \cdot \nabla_y G(x, x_{j,n}) \right\} + o(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}) \tag{2.12}$$

uniformly in $\overline{\Omega} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m B_R(\kappa_j)$, where

$$\gamma_{j,n}^0 = \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} \lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n \, dx$$

and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{j,n}^{\mathbf{1}} = (\gamma_{j,n}^{1,1}, \gamma_{j,n}^{1,2})$ with

$$\gamma_{j,n}^{1,\alpha} = \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} (x - x_{j,n})_\alpha \lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n \, dx, \quad \alpha = 1, 2.$$

Proof. We may assume $x_{j,n} \in B_{\frac{R}{4}}(\kappa_j)$. Using Green's representation formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{v_n(x)}{\mu_n} &= \int_\Omega G(x,y) \lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n dy \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^m \int_{B_{\frac{R}{4}}(x_{j,n})} G(x,y) \lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n dy + \int_{\Omega \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m B_{\frac{R}{4}}(x_{j,n})} G(x,y) \lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n dy. \end{aligned}$$

Here it holds that,

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int_{\Omega \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m B_{\frac{R}{4}}(x_{j,n})} G(x,y) \lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n \right| \\ &\le O(\lambda_n) \int_{\Omega \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m B_{\frac{R}{4}}(x_{j,n})} |G(x,y)| dy = O(\lambda_n). \end{aligned}$$

Taylor's theorem, on the other hand, implies

$$G(x,y) = G(x, x_{j,n}) + (y - x_{j,n}) \cdot \nabla_y G(x, x_{j,n}) + s(x, \eta, y - x_{j,n})$$

for $x \in \overline{\Omega} \setminus B_R(\kappa_j) \Rightarrow x \in \overline{\Omega} \setminus B_{\frac{R}{4}}(x_{j,n})$ and $y \in B_{\frac{R}{4}}(x_{j,n})$, where

$$\begin{aligned} s(x, \eta, y - x_{j,n}) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \le \alpha, \beta \le 2} G_{y_\alpha y_\beta}(x, \eta)(y - x_{j,n})_\alpha (y - x_{j,n})_\beta, \\ \eta &= \eta(j, n, y) \in B_{\frac{R}{4}}(x_{j,n}). \end{aligned}$$

Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_{\frac{R}{4}}(x_{j,n})} G(x,y) \lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n dy &= G(x, x_{j,n}) \int_{B_{\frac{R}{4}}(x_{j,n})} \lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n dy \\ &+ \nabla_y G(x, x_{j,n}) \cdot \int_{B_{\frac{R}{4}}(x_{j,n})} (y - x_{j,n}) \lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n dy \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \le \alpha, \beta \le 2} \int_{B_{\frac{R}{4}}(x_{j,n})} (y - x_{j,n})_\alpha (y - x_{j,n})_\beta G_{y_\alpha y_\beta}(x, \eta) \lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n dy. \end{aligned}$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_{\frac{R}{4}}(x_{j,n})}\lambda_n e^{u_n}v_n dy &= \gamma_{j,n}^0-\int_{B_R(\kappa_j)\setminus B_{\frac{R}{4}}(x_{j,n})}\lambda_n e^{u_n}v_n dy=\gamma_{j,n}^0+O(\lambda_n)\\ &=\gamma_{j,n}^0+o\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)\end{aligned}$$

and also

$$\int_{B_{\frac{R}{4}}(x_{j,n})}(y-x_{j,n})_\alpha\lambda_n e^{u_n}v_n dy=\gamma_{j,n}^{1,\alpha}+O(\lambda_n)=\gamma_{j,n}^{1,\alpha}+o\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right).$$

Finally, taking $\varepsilon\in(0,1)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\int_{B_{\frac{R}{4}}(x_{j,n})}G_{y_\alpha y_\beta}(x,\eta)(y-x_{j,n})_\alpha(y-x_{j,n})_\beta\lambda_n e^{u_n}v_n dy\right|\\ &\le CR^\varepsilon\int_{B_{\frac{R}{4}}(x_{j,n})}|y-x_{j,n}|^{2-\varepsilon}\lambda_n e^{u_n}dy\\ &=CR^\varepsilon\delta_{j,n}^{2-\varepsilon}\int_{B_{\frac{R}{4\delta_{j,n}}}(0)}|\widetilde{y}|^{2-\varepsilon}e^{\widetilde{u}_{j,n}}d\widetilde{y}=O\left(\delta_{j,n}^{2-\varepsilon}\right)=o\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)\end{aligned}$$

by (2.7). The proof is complete. □

Remark 2.6. Using that

$$\frac{\nabla v_n}{\mu_n}=\int_\Omega\nabla_x G(x,y)\lambda_n e^{u_n}v_n dy,$$

similarly we have

$$\frac{1}{\mu_n}\cdot\frac{\partial v_n}{\partial x_\alpha}=\sum_{j-1}^{m}\left\{\gamma_{j,n}^0 G_{x_\alpha}(x,x_{j,n})+\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{j,n}^{\mathbf{1}}\cdot\nabla_y G_{x_\alpha}(x,x_{j,n})\right\}+o\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)\tag{2.13}$$

for $\alpha=1,2$, uniformly in $\overline{\Omega}\setminus\cup_{j=1}^m B_R(\kappa_j)$.

Remark 2.7. Since $\gamma_{j,n}^0=O(1)$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{j,n}^{\mathbf{1}}=O(1)$, we have

$$v_n=O(\mu_n)\quad \text{in } C^1\left(\overline{\Omega}\setminus\cup_{j=1}^m B_R(k_j)\right)\tag{2.14}$$

for every $\mu_\infty\in\mathbb{R}$.

Proposition 2.8. *If $\mu_\infty\neq 0$ then it follows that*

$$\gamma_{j,n}^0=O\left(\frac{1}{\log\lambda_n}\right)\tag{2.15}$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{j,n}^{\mathbf{1}}=O\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right).\tag{2.16}$$

Proof. From equations (1.1) and (1.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} \Big(\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial \nu} \frac{v_n}{\mu_n} - u_n \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \frac{v_n}{\mu_n} \Big)\, dx &= \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} \left(\Delta u_n \frac{v_n}{\mu_n} - u_n \Delta \frac{v_n}{\mu_n} \right)\, dx \\
&= -\lambda_n \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} e^{u_n} \frac{v_n}{\mu_n}\, dx + \lambda_n \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} e^{u_n} v_n u_n\, dx \\
&= -\lambda_n \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} e^{u_n} \frac{v_n}{\mu_n}\, dx + u_n(x_{j,n}) \lambda_n \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} e^{u_n} v_n\, dx \\
&\quad + \lambda_n \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} e^{u_n} v_n \big\{ u_n - u_n(x_{j,n}) \big\}\, dx \\
&= \left(u_n(x_{j,n}) - \frac{1}{\mu_n} \right) \gamma^0_{j,n} + \lambda_n \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} e^{u_n} v_n \big\{ u_n - u_n(x_{j,n}) \big\}\, dx. \qquad (2.17)
\end{aligned}$$

Here it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_n \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} e^{u_n} v_n \big\{ u_n - u_n(x_{j,n}) \big\}\, dx &= \int_{B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{j,n}}}(0)} e^{\widetilde{u}_{j,n}} \widetilde{v}_{j,n} \widetilde{u}_{j,n}\, d\widetilde{x} \\
&\longrightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U V_j U = O(1), \qquad (2.18)
\end{aligned}$$

while (1.3) and (2.13) imply

$$\int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} \Big(\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial \nu} \frac{v_n}{\mu_n} - u_n \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \frac{v_n}{\mu_n} \Big)\, dx = O(1). \qquad (2.19)$$

Hence we obtain

$$\gamma^0_{j,n} = \frac{O(1)}{u_n(x_{j,n}) - \frac{1}{\mu_n}} = O\left(\frac{1}{\log \lambda_n} \right)$$

by (2.17), (2.4) and under the assumption of $\mu_\infty \neq 0$. Moreover

$$\begin{aligned}
|\gamma^{1,\alpha}_{j,n}| &\le \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} |y - x_{j,n}| \lambda_n e^{u_n} dy \\
&= \delta_{j,n} \int_{B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{j,n}}}(0)} |\widetilde{y}| e^{\widetilde{u}_{j,n}} d\widetilde{y} = O(\delta_{j,n}) = O\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \right). \qquad (2.20)
\end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 2.9. *For every* $\mu_\infty \in \mathbb{R}$ *it holds that*

$$v_n \longrightarrow 0 \quad \textit{in } C^1 \left(\overline{\Omega} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m B_R(\kappa_j) \right). \qquad (2.21)$$

Proof. If $\mu_\infty = 0$ (2.21) follows by Remark 2.7. Otherwise, if $\mu_\infty \neq 0$ then (2.21) follows by Proposition 2.5 and Proposition 2.8. □

Remark 2.10. For every $\mu_\infty \neq 0$ (2.19) becomes

$$\int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} \Big(\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial \nu} \frac{v_n}{\mu_n} - u_n \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \frac{v_n}{\mu_n} \Big) \, dx = o(1). \tag{2.22}$$

This estimate will be useful in the sequel.

Proposition 2.11. *There exists $j \in \{1, \cdots, m\}$ satisfying $V_j \not\equiv 0$.*

Proof. It is enough to show

$$v_n \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{uniformly in } B_R(\kappa_j) \tag{2.23}$$

if $V_j \equiv 0$. In fact, if (2.23) holds for all $j \in \{1, \cdots, m\}$ then we obtain

$$v_n \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{uniformly in } \overline{\Omega}$$

from (2.21), which contradicts the hypothesis $\|v_n\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = 1$.

Property (2.23) is proven using the same argument in [GOS11, (5.2)]. If (2.23) does not hold, we have

$$\limsup_{n \to +\infty} \max_{x \in B_R(\kappa_j)} |v_n(x)| = \limsup_{n \to +\infty} \max_{x \in B_{2R}(x_{j,n})} |v_n(x)| = M > 0$$

since $B_R(\kappa_j) \Subset B_{2R}(x_{j,n})$ for $n \gg 1$ and (2.21). Let $\tilde{z}_{j,n} \in B_{\frac{2R}{\delta_{j,n}}}(0)$ be the points such that

$$\widetilde{v}_{j,n}(\tilde{z}_{j,n}) = \sup_{B_{\frac{2R}{\delta_{j,n}}}(0)} |\widetilde{v}_{j,n}(x)|.$$

Up to a sub-sequences (denoted by the same symbol), it holds that

$$|\tilde{v}_{j,n}(\tilde{z}_{j,n})| = \max_{x \in B_{2R}(x_{j,n})} |v_n(x)| \to M, \quad |\tilde{z}_{j,n}| \to +\infty$$

by $V_j \equiv 0$.

Here we take the Kelvin transform of $\tilde{u}_{j,n}$ and $\tilde{v}_{j,n}$, i.e.,

$$\hat{u}_{j,n}(x) = \tilde{u}_{j,n}\Big(\frac{x}{|x|^2} \Big), \quad \hat{v}_{j,n}(x) = \tilde{v}_{j,n}\Big(\frac{x}{|x|^2} \Big)$$

which satisfy

$$-\Delta \hat{v}_{j,n} = \frac{\mu_n}{|\hat{x}|^4} e^{\hat{u}_{j,n}} \hat{v}_{j,n} \quad \text{ in } B_{\frac{\delta_{j,n}}{2R}}(0)^c.$$

Here we have

$$\hat{z}_{j,n} \in B_1(0) \setminus \overline{B_{\frac{\delta_{j,n}}{2R}}(0)}, \quad \hat{z}_{j,n} \to 0, \quad \hat{v}_{j,n}(\hat{z}_{j,n}) = \tilde{v}_{j,n}(\tilde{z}_{j,n}) \to M. \tag{2.24}$$

for $\hat{z}_{j,n}=\frac{\tilde{z}_{j,n}}{|\tilde{z}_{j,n}|^2}$. Let $w_{j,n}\in H^1_0(B_1(0))$ be such that

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta w_{j,n}=f_{j,n} & \text{in } B_1(0)\\ w_{j,n}=0 & \text{on } \partial B_1(0)\end{cases}$$

where

$$f_{j,n}:=\begin{cases} \frac{\mu_n}{|\hat{x}|^4}e^{\hat{u}_{j,n}}\hat{v}_{j,n} & \text{in } B_1(0)\setminus\overline{B_{\frac{\delta_{j,n}}{2R}}(0)}\\ 0 & \text{in } B_{\frac{\delta_{j,n}}{2R}}(0).\end{cases}$$

We have, from (2.7)

$$0\le\frac{\mu_n}{|\hat{x}|^4}e^{\hat{u}_{j,n}}\le C<\infty$$

where C is a constant independent on n. We have, on the other hand, $\hat{v}_{j,n}(\hat{x})=\tilde{v}_{j,n}(\widetilde{x})\to 0$ for every $\hat{x}\in B_R(0)\setminus\{0\}$ by $V_j\equiv 0$. Therefore, it holds that

$$\|f_{j,n}\|_{L^p(B_1(0))}\to 0\quad\text{ for each } p\in[1,+\infty)$$

by the dominated convergence theorem which implies

$$w_{j,n}\to 0 \text{ uniformly in } B_1(0)$$

from the elliptic theory.

We turn to the difference $\hat{v}_{j,n}-w_{j,n}$ which is harmonic in $B_1(0)\setminus\overline{B_{\frac{\delta_{j,n}}{2R}}(0)}$. Then the maximum principle guarantees

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\hat{v}_{j,n}-w_{j,n}\|_{L^\infty\left(B_1(0)\setminus\overline{B_{\frac{\delta_{j,n}}{2R}}(0)}\right)}\\ &\le\|\hat{v}_{j,n}-w_{j,n}\|_{L^\infty\left(\partial B_1(0)\right)}+\|\hat{v}_{j,n}-w_{j,n}\|_{L^\infty\left(\partial B_{\frac{\delta_{j,n}}{2R}}(0)\right)}\\ &\le\|\hat{v}_{j,n}\|_{L^\infty\left(\partial B_1(0)\right)}+\|\hat{v}_{j,n}\|_{L^\infty\left(\partial B_{\frac{\delta_{j,n}}{2R}}(0)\right)}+\|w_{j,n}\|_{L^\infty\left(\partial B_{\frac{\delta_{j,n}}{2R}}(0)\right)}.\end{aligned}$$

Here, it follows from $V_j\equiv 0$ that

$$\|\hat{v}_{j,n}\|_{L^\infty\left(\partial B_1(0)\right)}=\|\tilde{v}_{j,n}\|_{L^\infty\left(\partial B_1(0)\right)}=o(1)$$

and from (2.21)

$$\|\hat{v}_{j,n}\|_{L^\infty\left(\partial B_{\frac{\delta_{j,n}}{2R}}(0)\right)}=\|\tilde{v}_{j,n}\|_{L^\infty\left(\partial B_{\frac{2R}{\delta_{j,n}}}(0)\right)}=\|v_n\|_{L^\infty\left(\partial B_{2R}(x_{j,n})\right)}=o(1).$$

Hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\hat{v}_{j,n}\|_{L^\infty\left(B_1(0)\setminus\overline{B_{\frac{\delta_{j,n}}{2R}}(0)}\right)}&\le\|w_{j,n}\|_{L^\infty\left(B_1(0)\right)}+\|\hat{v}_{j,n}-w_{j,n}\|_{L^\infty\left(B_1(0)\setminus\overline{B_{\frac{\delta_{j,n}}{2R}}(0)}\right)}\\ &=o(1)\end{aligned}$$

which contradicts (2.24). □

Corollary 2.12. *We have that μ_∞ is an eigenvalue of* (2.10).

2.2 The case of $\mu_\infty = 0$ and $\mu_\infty = 1$

In this section we consider the cases $\mu_\infty = 0$ and $\mu_\infty = 1$ and we improve the estimate of the previous section. First we start with a sharp estimate for $\mu_\infty = 0$.

Proposition 2.13. *If* $\mu_\infty = 0$ *it holds that*

$$\gamma^0_{j,n} = 8\pi c_j + o(1), \tag{2.25}$$

and

$$\mu_n = -\frac{1}{2\log \lambda_n} + o\left(\frac{1}{\log \lambda_n}\right).$$

Proof. It holds that

$$\gamma^0_{j,n} = \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} \lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n = \int_{B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{j,n}}}(0)} e^{\tilde{u}_{j,n}} \tilde{v}_{j,n} \longrightarrow c_j \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U = 8\pi c_j.$$

We repeat the argument used for the proof of Proposition 2.8, using (2.17). First,

$$\int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} \left(\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial \nu}\frac{v_n}{\mu_n} - u_n \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}\frac{v_n}{\mu_n}\right) = O(1)$$

holds by (1.3) and (2.14). Next, the limit of (2.18) is equal to $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U V_j U = c_j \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U U$ in this case. Hence it follows that, using (2.25)

$$O(1) = \left\{u_n(x_{j,n}) - \frac{1}{\mu_n}\right\}\{8\pi c_j + o(1)\} + c_j \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U U + o(1).$$

Let $j \in \{1, \cdots, m\}$ be such that $c_j \neq 0$, assured by Proposition 2.11. Then the above relation implies

$$u_n(x_{j,n}) - \frac{1}{\mu_n} = O(1)$$

and consequently, the conclusion by (2.4). □

Now we consider the case of $\mu_\infty = 1$. The proof of the asymptotic behavior of μ_n for $\mu_\infty = 1$ will be performed in several steps.

Proposition 2.14. *If* $\mu_\infty = 1$ *then it holds that*

$$\gamma^0_{j,n} = \frac{8\pi b_j + o(1)}{\log \lambda_n}, \tag{2.26}$$

$$\frac{\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\mathbf{1}}_{j,n}}{\delta_{j,n}} = -8\pi \boldsymbol{a}_j + o(1), \tag{2.27}$$

and

$$v_n = \sum_{j=1}^m \left\{\frac{8\pi b_j + o(1)}{\log \lambda_n} G(x, x_{j,n}) - 8\pi d_j \lambda^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{a}_j \cdot \nabla_y G(x, x_{j,n})\right\} + o\left(\lambda^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)$$
$$\text{in } C^1\left(\overline{\Omega} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m B_R(\kappa_j)\right). \tag{2.28}$$

Proof. By (2.17) and (2.22) we get

$$\gamma_{j,n}^0 = \frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U V_j U + o(1)}{2\log\lambda_n}.$$

Since $\mu_\infty = 1$, we obtain

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U V_j U = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U \left(\boldsymbol{a}_j \cdot \nabla U + b_j \overline{U}\right) U = 16\pi b_j$$

by Lemma A.1, proving (2.26).
Similarly to (2.20) we have, from Remark 2.4

$$\frac{\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{j,n}^{\mathbf{1}}}{\delta_{j,n}} \longrightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \widetilde{y} e^U \left\{\boldsymbol{a}_j \cdot \nabla U + b_j \overline{U}\right\} = -8\pi \boldsymbol{a}_j$$

which proves (2.27).
Finally (2.28) follows by (2.3), (2.26) and (2.27).

□

The next proposition is a refinement of (2.15). It relies on a bi-linear form of the Rellich-Pohozaev identity described below. We omit the elementary proof of this identity (see [O12, Proposition 5.5] for details).

Proposition 2.15. *For every $p \in \mathbb{R}^2$, $R > 0$, and $f, g \in C^2\left(\overline{B_R(p)}\right)$, it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_R(p)} &\{[(x-p)\cdot\nabla f]\Delta g + \Delta f[(x-p)\cdot\nabla g]\} \\ &= R\int_{\partial B_R(p)} \left(2\frac{\partial f}{\partial \nu}\frac{\partial g}{\partial \nu} - \nabla f \cdot \nabla g\right). \qquad (2.29)\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2.16. *If $\mu_\infty = 1$ it holds that*

$$\gamma_{j,n}^0 = (1-\mu_n)\left\{\frac{16\pi}{3} b_j + o(1)\right\} + o\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right). \qquad (2.30)$$

Proof. Putting $p = x_{j,n}$, $f = u_n$, and $g = v_n$ on the left-hand side of (2.29), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} \{[(x - x_{j,n}) \cdot \nabla u_n]\Delta v_n + \Delta u_n[(x - x_{j,n}) \cdot \nabla v_n]\} \\
&= \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} \{[(x - x_{j,n}) \cdot \nabla u_n](-\lambda_n \mu_n e^{u_n} v_n) - \lambda_n e^{u_n}[(x - x_{j,n}) \cdot \nabla v_n]\} \\
&= -\int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} (x - x_{j,n}) \cdot \nabla \left(\lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n\right) \\
&\qquad + (1-\mu_n) \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} [(x - x_{j,n}) \cdot \nabla u_n](\lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n) \\
&= -\int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} [(x - x_{j,n}) \cdot \nu]\lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n + 2\int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} \lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n \\
&\qquad + (1-\mu_n) \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} [(x - x_{j,n}) \cdot \nabla u_n](\lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n) \qquad \text{and by (2.28)} \\
&= 2\gamma_{j,n}^0 + (1-\mu_n) \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} [(x - x_{j,n}) \cdot \nabla u_n](\lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n) + o(\lambda_n).
\end{aligned}$$

Here, Lemma A.3 implies

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} [(x - x_{j,n}) \cdot \nabla u_n](\lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n) = \int_{B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{j,n}}}(0)} \left(\widetilde{x} \cdot \nabla_{\widetilde{x}} \widetilde{u}_{j,n}\right) e^{\widetilde{u}_{j,n}} \widetilde{v}_{j,n} \\
&\longrightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \left(\widetilde{x} \cdot \nabla U\right) e^U V_j = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U \overline{U} \left(\boldsymbol{a}_j \cdot \nabla U + b_j \overline{U}\right) - 2\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U \left(\boldsymbol{a}_j \cdot \nabla U + b_j \overline{U}\right) \\
&\quad = \frac{32\pi}{3} b_j,
\end{aligned}$$

(see Lemma A.1 for the last integration). Therefore, by (2.29) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_{j,n}^0 = &-(1-\mu_n)\left\{\frac{16\pi}{3} b_j + o(1)\right\} \\
&+ \frac{R\mu_n}{2} \int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} \left(2\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial \nu} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \frac{v_n}{\mu_n} - \nabla u_n \cdot \nabla \frac{v_n}{\mu_n}\right) + o\left(\lambda_n\right). \qquad (2.31)
\end{aligned}$$

From (2.13) and (2.27), it follows that

$$\nabla \frac{v_n(x)}{\mu_n} = -\frac{\gamma_{j,n}^0}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{\nu}{R} + 4d_j \frac{\boldsymbol{a}_j - 2(\boldsymbol{a}_j \cdot \nu)\nu}{R^2} \lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + \nabla h_{j,n}(x) + o\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)$$

on $\partial B_R\left(x_{j,n}\right)$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
h_{j,n}(x) = &\gamma_{j,n}^0 K(x, x_{j,n}) + \sum_{1 \le i \le m, i \ne j} \gamma_{i,n}^0 G(x, x_{i,n}) \\
&+ \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{j,n}^{\boldsymbol{1}} \cdot \nabla_y K(x, x_{j,n}) + \sum_{1 \le i \le m, i \ne j} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{i,n}^{\boldsymbol{1}} \cdot \nabla_y G(x, x_{i,n}).
\end{aligned}$$

We note that $h_{j,n}$ is harmonic in $B_R\left(x_{j,n}\right)$. Arguing as in Proposition 2.5 and Remark 2.6, we have

$$\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \left\{ \sigma_{j,n}^0 G_{x_\alpha}(x, x_{j,n}) + \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{j,n}^{\mathbf{1}} \cdot \nabla_y G_{x_\alpha}(x, x_{j,n}) \right\} + o\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)$$

for $\alpha = 1, 2$ uniformly in $\overline{\Omega} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m B_R(\kappa_j)$, where

$$\sigma_{j,n}^0 = \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} \lambda_n e^{u_n} \longrightarrow 8\pi$$

and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{j,n}^{\mathbf{1}} = (\sigma_{j,n}^{1,1}, \sigma_{j,n}^{1,2})$ with

$$\sigma_{j,n}^{1,\alpha} = \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} (y - x_{j,n})_\alpha \lambda_n e^{u_n} dy.$$

Similarly to (2.27), inequality (2.7) implies

$$\frac{\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{j,n}^{\mathbf{1}}}{\delta_{j,n}} = \frac{1}{\delta_{j,n}} \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} (y - x_{j,n}) \lambda_n e^{u_n} \longrightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \widetilde{y} e^U = \mathbf{0},$$

i.e., $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{j,n}^{\mathbf{1}} = o(\delta_{j,n}) = o\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)$. Then we obtain

$$\nabla u_n(x) = -\frac{\sigma_{j,n}^0}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{\nu}{R} + \nabla k_{j,n}(x) + o\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \tag{2.32}$$

on $\partial B_R\left(x_{j,n}\right)$ by (1.3), where

$$k_{j,n}(x) = \sigma_{j,n}^0 K(x, x_{j,n}) + \sum_{1 \le i \le m, i \ne j} \sigma_{i,n}^0 G(x, x_{i,n}).$$

These formulae imply

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} 2 \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial \nu} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} \frac{v_n}{\mu_n} &= 2 \int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} \left(-\frac{\sigma_{j,n}^0}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{1}{R} + \frac{\partial k_{j,n}}{\partial \nu} \right) \\
&\quad \times \left(-\frac{\gamma_{j,n}^0}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{1}{R} + 4 d_j \frac{-\boldsymbol{a}_j \cdot \nu}{R^2} \lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{\partial h_{j,n}}{\partial \nu} \right) + o\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\
&= \frac{\sigma_{j,n}^0 \gamma_{j,n}^0}{\pi R} + \frac{4 \sigma_{j,n}^0 d_j \lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\pi R^3} \int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} \boldsymbol{a}_j \cdot \nu - \frac{\sigma_{j,n}^0}{\pi R} \int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} \frac{\partial h_{j,n}}{\partial \nu} \\
&\quad - \frac{\gamma_{j,n}^0}{\pi R} \int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} \frac{\partial k_{j,n}}{\partial \nu} - \frac{8 d_j \lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}}{R^2} \int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} (\boldsymbol{a}_j \cdot \nu) \frac{\partial k_{j,n}}{\partial \nu} \\
&\quad + \int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} 2 \frac{\partial k_{j,n}}{\partial \nu} \frac{\partial h_{j,n}}{\partial \nu} + o\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\
&= \frac{\sigma_{j,n}^0 \gamma_{j,n}^0}{\pi R} - \frac{8 d_j \lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}}{R^2} \int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} (\boldsymbol{a}_j \cdot \nu) \frac{\partial k_{j,n}}{\partial \nu} \\
&\quad + \int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} 2 \frac{\partial k_{j,n}}{\partial \nu} \frac{\partial h_{j,n}}{\partial \nu} + o\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

by the divergence formula because $h_{j,n}$ and $k_{j,n}$ are harmonic in $B_R\left(x_{j,n}\right)$.
Similarly it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} \nabla u_n \cdot \nabla \frac{v_n}{\mu_n} &= \int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} \left(-\frac{\sigma^0_{j,n}}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{\nu}{R} + \nabla k_{j,n} \right) \\ &\quad \cdot \left(-\frac{\gamma^0_{j,n}}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{\nu}{R} + 4d_j \frac{\boldsymbol{a}_j - 2(\boldsymbol{a}_j \cdot \nu)\nu}{R^2} \lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}} + \nabla h_{j,n} \right) + o\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\ &= \frac{\sigma^0_{j,n}\gamma^0_{j,n}}{2\pi R} + \frac{4d_j\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}}{R^2} \int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} \boldsymbol{a}_j \cdot \nabla k_{j,n} - \frac{8d_j\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}}{R^2} \int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} (\boldsymbol{a}_j \cdot \nu) \frac{\partial k_{j,n}}{\partial \nu} \\ &\quad + \int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} \nabla k_{j,n} \cdot \nabla h_{j,n} + o\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Here, the identity

$$\int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} 2\frac{\partial k_{j,n}}{\partial \nu}\frac{\partial h_{j,n}}{\partial \nu} - \int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} \nabla k_{j,n} \cdot \nabla h_{j,n} = 0$$

follows again from the bi-linear Pohozaev identity (2.29) because $h_{j,n}$ and $k_{j,n}$ are harmonic. We have also

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{4d_j\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}}{R^2} \int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} \boldsymbol{a}_j \cdot \nabla k_{j,n} &= \frac{4d_j\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}}{R^2} |\partial B_R\left(x_{j,n}\right)| \boldsymbol{a}_j \cdot \nabla k_{j,n}(x_{j,n}) \\ &= \frac{8\pi d_j\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}}{R} \boldsymbol{a}_j \cdot \nabla k_{j,n}(x_{j,n}) = o\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)\end{aligned}$$

by the mean value theorem for harmonic functions, because, from (1.5)

$$\nabla k_{j,n}(x_{j,n}) \longrightarrow 8\pi \nabla \left(K(x,\kappa_j) + \sum_{1 \le i \le m,\, i \ne j} G(x,\kappa_i) \right)\Bigg|_{x=\kappa_j} = 0.$$

Plugging these formulae to (2.31), we end up with

$$\gamma^0_{j,n} = -(1-\mu_n)\left\{ \frac{16\pi}{3} b_j + o(1) \right\} + \frac{\sigma^0_{j,n}\gamma^0_{j,n}\mu_n}{4\pi} + o\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right),$$

which means, since $\sigma^0_{j,n} \longrightarrow 8\pi$ and $\mu_n \longrightarrow 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma^0_{j,n} &= \frac{-(1-\mu_n)\left\{\frac{16\pi}{3}b_j + o(1)\right\} + o\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)}{1 - \frac{\sigma^0_{j,n}\mu_n}{4\pi}} \\ &= (1-\mu_n)\left\{ \frac{16\pi}{3} b_j + o(1) \right\} + o\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right). \qquad (2.33)\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 2.17. *Let* $\mu_\infty = 1$ *and* $b_j \neq 0$ *for some* $j \in \{1, \cdots, m\}$*. Then it holds that*

$$\mu_n = 1 - \frac{3}{2}\frac{1}{\log \lambda_n} + o\left(\frac{1}{\log \lambda_n}\right).$$

Proof. Combining Propositions 2.14 and 2.16 we have

$$\frac{8\pi b_j + o(1)}{\log \lambda_n} = (1 - \mu_n)\left\{\frac{16\pi}{3} b_j + o(1)\right\} + o\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right).$$

Then we obtain, since $b_j \neq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_n &= 1 - \frac{8\pi b_j + o(1)}{\frac{16\pi}{3} b_j + o(1)} \cdot \frac{1}{\log \lambda_n} + o\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)\\ &= 1 - \frac{3}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{\log \lambda_n} + o\left(\frac{1}{\log \lambda_n}\right).\end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 2.18. By Proposition 2.17, we only have to consider the cases $b_j = 0$ ($j = 1, \cdots, m$) to calculate the Morse index of u_n because, by the last proposition, we have that $\mu_n > 1$, for n large enough, if $b_j \neq 0$.

Let $D = (D_{ij})$ be the diagonal matrix $\mathrm{diag}[d_1, d_1, d_2, d_2, \cdots, d_m, d_m]$, i.e. D takes the diagonal components $D_{2j-1,2j-1} = D_{2j,2j} = d_j$ for $j = 1, \cdots, m$.
Let us introduce some notations. Set

$$\begin{aligned}&I_{\alpha\beta}(z_1, z_2, z_3)\\ &:= \int_{\partial B_R(z_1)} \left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu_x} G_{x_\alpha}(x, z_2) G_{y_\beta}(x, z_3) - G_{x_\alpha}(x, z_2)\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu_x} G_{y_\beta}(x, z_3)\right\} d\sigma_x\\ &= \begin{cases} 0 & (z_1 \neq z_2,\ z_1 \neq z_3)\\ \frac{1}{2} R_{x_\alpha x_\beta}(z_1) & (z_1 = z_2 = z_3)\\ G_{x_\alpha y_\beta}(z_1, z_3) & (z_1 = z_2,\ z_1 \neq z_3)\\ G_{x_\alpha x_\beta}(z_1, z_2) & (z_1 \neq z_2,\ z_1 = z_3),\end{cases}\end{aligned} \tag{2.34}$$

(see [GOS11, Proposition 2.3]). We prove a crucial estimate for the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proposition 2.19. *If* $1 - \mu_n = o\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)$*, there exists* $\eta \in \mathbb{R}$ *such that*

$$\mu_n = 1 - 48\pi\eta\lambda_n + o(\lambda_n). \tag{2.35}$$

Moreover η *is an eigenvalue of the matrix* $D\{\mathrm{Hess} H^m(\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m)\}D$*.*

Proof. Since $1-\mu_n = o\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)$ it holds that

$$v_n = -8\pi\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{j=1}^{m} d_j \boldsymbol{a}_j \cdot \nabla_y G(x, x_{j,n}) + o\left(\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \tag{2.36}$$

in $C^1\left(\overline{\Omega} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m B_R(\kappa_j)\right)$ by (2.12), (2.27), (2.30) and (2.3).

Using that

$$-\Delta \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha} = \lambda_n e^{u_n} \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha} \quad \text{in } \Omega,$$

we have, for $\alpha = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}\left(\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha}\right) \frac{v_n}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}} - \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}\left(\frac{v_n}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right) \right\} d\sigma_x \\
&\quad = \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} \left(\Delta \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha} \frac{v_n}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}} - \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha} \Delta \frac{v_n}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right) dx \\
&\quad = \frac{-1+\mu_n}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}} \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} \lambda_n e^{u_n} \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha} v_n \, dx \\
&\quad = \frac{\mu_n - 1}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \delta_{j,n}} \int_{B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{j,n}}}(0)} e^{\widetilde{u}_{j,n}} \frac{\partial \widetilde{u}_{j,n}}{\partial \widetilde{x}_\alpha} \widetilde{v}_{j,n} \, d\widetilde{x}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.37}$$

Then we obtain, recalling that $b_j = 0$,

$$\int_{B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{j,n}}}(0)} e^{\widetilde{u}_{j,n}} \frac{\partial \widetilde{u}_{j,n}}{\partial \widetilde{x}_\alpha} \widetilde{v}_{j,n} \, d\widetilde{x} \longrightarrow \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U U_\alpha \left(\boldsymbol{a}_j \cdot \nabla U\right) = \frac{4\pi}{3} a_{j,\alpha} \tag{2.38}$$

where $\boldsymbol{a}_j = (a_{j,1}, a_{j,2})$, by (2.7) and Lemma A.3 (see Lemma A.1 for the last integration). Then, by (2.34)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{1 \le k \le m} I_{\alpha\beta}(\kappa_j, \kappa_k, \kappa_l) \\
&= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} R_{x_\alpha x_\beta}(\kappa_j) + \sum\limits_{\substack{1 \leqq k \leqq m \\ k \neq j}} G_{x_\alpha x_\beta}(\kappa_j, \kappa_k), & (j = l) \\ G_{x_\alpha y_\beta}(\kappa_j, \kappa_l), & (j \neq l) \end{cases} \\
&= H^m_{x_{j,\alpha} x_{l,\beta}}(\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover from (2.36) and (1.3), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\partial B_R(x_{j,n})} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}\left(\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha}\right)\frac{v_n}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}} - \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha}\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}\left(\frac{v_n}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right)\right\} dx \qquad (2.39)\\
&\quad\longrightarrow \int_{\partial B_R(\kappa_j)} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} 8\pi \sum_{k=1}^m G_{x_\alpha}(x,\kappa_k)\cdot(-8\pi)\sum_{l=1}^m d_l \boldsymbol{a}_l \cdot \nabla_y G(x,\kappa_l)\right.\\
&\qquad\qquad \left. -8\pi \sum_{k=1}^m G_{x_\alpha}(x,\kappa_k)\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}(-8\pi)\sum_{l=1}^m d_l \boldsymbol{a}_l\cdot\nabla_y G(x,\kappa_l)\right\} d\sigma_x\\
&\quad = -64\pi^2 \sum_{1\le k,l\le m} d_l \sum_{\beta=1}^2 a_{l,\beta} I_{\alpha\beta}(\kappa_j,\kappa_k,\kappa_l)\\
&\quad = -64\pi^2 \sum_{\substack{1\le l\le m\\ \beta=1,2}} \left(\sum_{1\le k\le m} I_{\alpha\beta}(\kappa_j,\kappa_k,\kappa_l)\right) d_l a_{l,\beta}\\
&\quad = -64\pi^2 \sum_{\substack{1\le l\le m\\ \beta=1,2}} H^m_{x_{j,\alpha}x_{l,\beta}}(\kappa_1,\cdots,\kappa_m) d_l a_{l,\beta}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, it follows from (2.37) and (2.38) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&-64\pi^2 \sum_{\substack{1\le l\le m\\ \beta=1,2}} H^m_{x_{j,\alpha}x_{l,\beta}}(\kappa_1,\cdots,\kappa_m) d_l a_{l,\beta} + o(1)\\
&\qquad = \frac{\mu_n - 1}{\lambda_n}\left\{\frac{4\pi}{3d_j} a_{j,\alpha} + o(1)\right\},
\end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1-\mu_n}{\lambda_n}\{a_{j,\alpha}+o(1)\}\\
&\quad = 48\pi d_j \sum_{\substack{1\le l\le m\\ \beta=1,2}} H^m_{x_{j,\alpha}x_{l,\beta}}(\kappa_1,\cdots,\kappa_m) d_l a_{l,\beta} + o(1)\\
&\quad = 48\pi \sum_{\substack{1\le l\le m\\ \beta=1,2}} (D\mathrm{Hess}H^m(\kappa_1,\cdots,\kappa_m)D)_{2(j-1)+\alpha,2(l-1)+\beta}\, a_{l,\beta} + o(1). \qquad (2.40)
\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 2.11, recalling that $b_j = 0$ for any j we have that $a_{j,\alpha} \neq 0$ for some $j = 1,\ldots,m$ and $\alpha = 1,2$. For such (j,α) it holds that

$$\frac{1-\mu_n}{48\pi\lambda_n} \longrightarrow \frac{\sum_{\substack{1\le l\le m\\ \beta=1,2}} (D\mathrm{Hess}H^m(\kappa_1,\cdots,\kappa_m)D)_{2(j-1)+\alpha,2(l-1)+\beta}\, a_{l,\beta}}{a_{j,\alpha}} =: \eta$$

and hence (2.35) follows. Then (2.40) implies

$$\eta a_{j,\alpha} = \sum_{\substack{1\le l\le m\\ \beta=1,2}} (D\mathrm{Hess}H^m(\kappa_1,\cdots,\kappa_m)D)_{2(j-1)+\alpha,2(l-1)+\beta}\, a_{l,\beta}$$

for any j and α. Thus η is an eigenvalue of $D\mathrm{Hess}H^m(\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m)D$ and the proof is complete. □

We conclude this section with some orthogonality relations between the eigenfunctions. Let v_n^l be the l-th eigenfunction of (1.6). Let $\mathfrak{c}^l$, $\mathfrak{a}^l$, and $\mathfrak{b}^l$ be the associated coefficients $\mathfrak{c}$, $\mathfrak{a}$, and $\mathfrak{b}$, arising in the limit of $\tilde{v}_n^l$ as $n \to \infty$ (see Remark 2.4). Thus we assume the orthogonality in Dirichlet norm,

$$\int_\Omega \nabla v_n^l \cdot \nabla v_n^{l'} = 0 \quad \text{if } l \neq l'. \tag{2.41}$$

Proposition 2.20. *We have the following,*

$i)$ *If* $\mu_\infty^l = 0$*, it holds that*

$$\int_\Omega \left|\nabla v_n^l\right|^2 \, dx = \mu_n^l \left\{8\pi \|\mathfrak{c}^l\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 + o(1)\right\} = -\frac{4\pi\|\mathfrak{c}^l\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2}{\log \lambda_n} + o\left(\frac{1}{\log \lambda_n}\right). \tag{2.42}$$

$ii)$ *If* $\mu_\infty^l = \mu_\infty^{l'} = 0$ *and* $l \neq l'$*, it holds that*

$$\mathfrak{c}^l \cdot \mathfrak{c}^{l'} = 0.$$

$iii)$ *If* $\mu_\infty^l = 1$*, it holds that*

$$\int_\Omega \left|\nabla v_n^l\right|^2 \, dx = \frac{4\pi}{3}\left(\|\mathfrak{a}^l\|_{\mathbb{R}^{2m}}^2 + 8\|\mathfrak{b}^l\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2\right) + o\left(1\right).$$

$iv)$ *If* $\mu_\infty^l = \mu_\infty^{l'} = 1$ *and* $l \neq l'$*, it holds that*

$$\mathfrak{a}^l \cdot \mathfrak{a}^{l'} + 8\mathfrak{b}^l \cdot \mathfrak{b}^{l'} = 0.$$

Proof. Each limit below is justified by (2.7) and the dominated convergence theorem.

$i)$ From (1.6) we have

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n^l|^2 \, dx = -\int_\Omega (\Delta v_n^l) v_n^l \, dx = \mu_n \lambda_n \int_\Omega e^{u_n} (v_n^l)^2 \, dx$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\mu_n}\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n^l|^2 \, dx = \lambda_n \int_\Omega e^{u_n}(v_n^l)^2 \, dx \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_n \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} e^{u_n}(v_n^l)^2 \, dx + \lambda_n \int_{\Omega \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^m B_R(x_{j,n})} e^{u_n}(v_n^l)^2 \, dx \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^m \int_{B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{j,n}}}(0)} e^{\tilde{u}_{j,n}} (\tilde{v}_{j,n}^l)^2 \, d\widetilde{x} + o(\lambda_n) \\
&\longrightarrow \sum_{j=1}^m \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U (c_j^l)^2 \, d\widetilde{x} = 8\pi \sum_{j=1}^m (c_j^l)^2 = 8\pi \|\mathfrak{c}^l\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 2.13 $i)$ follows.

$ii)$ If $l \neq l'$, we have

$$0 = \int_\Omega \nabla v_n^l \cdot \nabla v_n^{l'}\, dx = -\int_\Omega \Delta v_n^l v_n^{l'}\, dx = \mu_n^l \lambda_n \int_\Omega e^{u_n} v_n^l v_n^{l'}\, dx.$$

Since $\mu_n^l > 0$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \lambda_n \int_\Omega e^{u_n} v_n^l v_n^{l'}\, dx \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^m \lambda_n \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} e^{u_n} v_n^l v_n^{l'}\, dx + \lambda_n \int_{\Omega \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^m B_R(x_{j,n})} e^{u_n} v_n^l v_n^{l'}\, dx \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^m \int_{B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{j,n}}}(0)} e^{\tilde{u}_{j,n}} \tilde{v}_{j,n}^l \tilde{v}_{j,n}^{l'}\, d\widetilde{x} + o(\lambda_n) \\ &\longrightarrow \sum_{j=1}^m \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U c_j^l c_j^{l'}\, d\widetilde{x} = 8\pi \mathfrak{c}^l \cdot \mathfrak{c}^{l'}. \end{aligned}$$

$iii)$ Similarly to the first case it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{\mu_n^l} \int_\Omega |\nabla v_n^l|^2\, dx \\ &= \lambda_n \int_\Omega e^{u_n} (v_n^l)^2\, dx = \sum_{j=1}^m \int_{B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{j,n}}}(0)} e^{\tilde{u}_{j,n}} (\tilde{v}_{j,n}^l)^2\, d\widetilde{x} + o(\lambda_n) \\ &\longrightarrow \sum_{j=1}^m \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U (\boldsymbol{a}_j^l \cdot \nabla U + b_j^l \overline{U})^2\, d\widetilde{x} = \frac{4\pi}{3} \|\mathfrak{a}^l\|_{\mathbb{R}^{2m}}^2 + \frac{32\pi}{3} \|\mathfrak{b}^l\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2, \end{aligned}$$

(see Lemma A.1 for the last integration).

$iv)$ The proof is similar to the second and the third cases.

□

3 Estimate of eigenvalues

In this section we provide the estimates (1.9), (1.10) and (1.11).

3.1 Estimates of $\mu_n^1, \dots, \mu_n^m$

The asymptotic behavior of the eigenvalues of (1.6) is estimated inductively. Let us start to study μ_n^1.

Take a cut-off function $\xi \in C_0^\infty([0,+\infty))$ satisfying

$$\xi(r) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } 0 \leq r \leq 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } r \geq 2 \end{cases} \qquad 0 \leq \xi(r) \leq 1,$$

and set

$$\xi_n(x) := \xi\left(\frac{|x - x_{i,n}|}{R}\right). \tag{3.1}$$

for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$.

Proposition 3.1. *The first eigenvalue* μ_n^1 *of* (1.6) *satisfies*

$$\mu_n^1 \longrightarrow 0 \quad \textit{as } n \to \infty.$$

Proof. By the classical Rayleigh-Ritz variational formula, it holds that

$$\mu_n^1 = \inf_{\substack{v \in H_0^1(\Omega) \\ v \not\equiv 0}} \frac{\int_\Omega |\nabla v|^2 \, dx}{\lambda_n \int_\Omega e^{u_n} v^2 \, dx} \leq \frac{\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n|^2 \, dx}{\lambda_n \int_\Omega e^{u_n} v_n^2 \, dx}$$

for any $v_n \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. Let $v_n := \xi_n u_n$.

Using the asymptotic behavior of u_n, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n|^2 \, dx &= \int_\Omega |\nabla(\xi_n u_n)|^2 \, dx = \int_{B_R(x_{i,n})} |\nabla u_n|^2 \, dx + O(1) \\
&= \int_{\partial B_R(x_{i,n})} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} u_n \cdot u_n \, d\sigma - \int_{B_R(x_{i,n})} \Delta u_n u_n \, dx + O(1) \\
&= \lambda_n \int_{B_R(x_{i,n})} e^{u_n} u_n \, dx + O(1) \\
&= u_n(x_{i,n}) \int_{B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{i,n}}}(0)} e^{\tilde{u}_{i,n}} \, d\widetilde{x} + \int_{B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{i,n}}}(0)} e^{\tilde{u}_{i,n}} \tilde{u}_{i,n} \, d\widetilde{x} + O(1) \\
&= u_n(x_{i,n}) \{8\pi + o(1)\} + O(1) \\
&= -16\pi \log \lambda_n + o(\log \lambda_n)
\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

as $n \to \infty$. Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_n \int_\Omega e^{u_n} v_n^2 \, dx &= \lambda_n \int_\Omega e^{u_n} \xi_n^2 u_n^2 \, dx = \lambda_n \int_{B_R(x_{i,n})} e^{u_n} u_n^2 \, dx + O\big(\lambda_n\big) \\
&= \int_{B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{i,n}}}(0)} e^{\tilde{u}_{i,n}} \tilde{u}_{i,n}^2 \, d\widetilde{x} + 2u_n(x_{i,n}) \int_{B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{i,n}}}(0)} e^{\tilde{u}_{i,n}} \tilde{u}_{i,n} \, d\widetilde{x} \\
&\quad + \Big(u_n(x_{i,n})\Big)^2 \int_{B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{i,n}}}(0)} e^{\tilde{u}_{i,n}} \, d\widetilde{x} + o(1) \\
&= \{8\pi + o(1)\} \Big(u_n(x_{i,n})\Big)^2 + O\left(u_n(x_{i,n})\right) \\
&= 32\pi \Big(\log \lambda_n\Big)^2 + o\left((\log \lambda_n)^2\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

From (3.2) and (3.3) we deduce

$$0 \le \mu_n^1 \le \frac{-16\pi \log \lambda_n + o(\log \lambda_n)}{32\pi\Big(\log \lambda_n\Big)^2 + o\left((\log \lambda_n)^2\right)} = -\frac{1}{2\log \lambda_n} + o\left(\frac{1}{\log \lambda_n}\right) \longrightarrow 0$$

and this concludes the proof. □

Remark 3.2. By Proposition 3.1 there exists $\mathfrak{c}^1 \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \{0\}$ such that

$$\tilde{v}_{j,n}^1 \longrightarrow c_j^1 \quad \text{in } C^{2,\alpha}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2),$$

by Remark 2.4 and Proposition 2.11.

In order to prove the estimate for $\mu_n^2, \dots, \mu_n^m$ we will proceed by induction.

Proposition 3.3. *It holds that $\mu_n^k \to 0$ for any $k = 2, \dots, m$.*

Proof. Given $k = 2, \cdots, m$, we suppose the l-th eigenvalue μ_n^l tends to 0 as $n \to +\infty$ for any $l \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$. Now we shall show $\mu_n^k \to 0$. Recall that v_n^l denotes the l-th eigenfunction of (1.6). By the above inductive hypothesis, there exist $\mathfrak{c}^1, \dots, \mathfrak{c}^{k-1} \in \mathbb{R}^m \setminus \{0\}$ and a sub-sequence of v_n^l (denoted by the same symbol) such that $\tilde{v}_{j,n}^l \longrightarrow c_j^l$ in $C^{2,\alpha}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for any $l = 1, \dots, k-1$ and $j = 1, \dots, m$. Moreover, Remark 2.7 implies

$$v_n^l \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } C^1\left(\overline{\Omega} \setminus \cup_{j=1}^m B_R(\kappa_j)\right) \tag{3.4}$$

for $l \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$ as $n \to \infty$.

From the variational characterization of the eigenvalues we have

$$\mu_n^k = \inf_{\substack{v \in H_0^1(\Omega),\, v \neq 0 \\ v \perp \mathrm{span}\{v_n^1, \dots, v_n^{k-1}\}}} \frac{\int_\Omega |\nabla v|^2 \, dx}{\lambda_n \int_\Omega e^{u_n} v^2 \, dx}.$$

We take the cut-off function $\xi \in C_0^\infty([0, +\infty))$ and define $\xi_n(x)$ by (3.1), with $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ determined later. Put

$$v_n := \xi_n u_n - s_n^1 v_n^1 - \cdots - s_n^{k-1} v_n^{k-1}$$

with

$$s_n^l := \frac{\int_\Omega \nabla\left(\xi_n u_n\right) \cdot \nabla v_n^l \, dx}{\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n^l|^2 \, dx}. \tag{3.5}$$

Then it follows that $v_n \perp \mathrm{span}\{v_n^1, \dots, v_n^{k-1}\}$ under the Dirichlet norm.

First, we show the following,

Claim: It holds that

$$s_n^l = -\frac{2c_i^l}{\|\mathfrak{c}^l\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^m}} \log \lambda_n + o(\log \lambda_n) \quad \text{as } n \to +\infty. \tag{3.6}$$

for $l = 1, \dots, k-1$.

Proof of the Claim. By (1.6), it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega \nabla(\xi_n u_n)\cdot\nabla v_n^l\,dx = -\int_\Omega \xi_n u_n \Delta v_n^l\,dx = \mu_n^l\lambda_n\int_\Omega e^{u_n} v_n^l \xi_n u_n\,dx\\
&= \mu_n^l\lambda_n\int_{B_R(x_{i,n})} e^{u_n} v_n^l u_n\,dx + \mu_n^l\lambda_n\int_{\Omega\setminus B_R(x_{i,n})} e^{u_n} v_n^l\xi_n u_n\,dx\\
&= \mu_n^l u_n(x_{i,n})\int_{B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{i,n}}}(0)} e^{\tilde{u}_{i,n}}\tilde{v}_{i,n}^l\,d\widetilde{x} + \mu_n^l\int_{B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{i,n}}}(0)} e^{\tilde{u}_{i,n}}\tilde{v}_{i,n}^l\tilde{u}_{i,n}\,d\widetilde{x} + o\Big(\mu_n^l\lambda_n\Big)\\
&= \left\{-\frac{1}{2\log\lambda_n} + o\left(\frac{1}{\log\lambda_n}\right)\right\}\{-2\log\lambda_n + O(1)\}\left\{8\pi {c_i}^l + o(1)\right\} + o(1)\\
&= 8\pi c_i^l + o(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Then (3.5) and $i)$ of Proposition 2.20 imply

$$s_n^l = \frac{8\pi c_i^l + o(1)}{-\frac{4\pi}{\log\lambda_n}\|\mathfrak{c}^l\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^m} + o\left(\frac{1}{\log\lambda_n}\right)}$$

and the proof of the claim is complete. □

For $v_n = \xi_n u_n - s_n^1 v_n^1 - \cdots - s_n^{k-1}v_n^{k-1}$, we have

$$\mu_n^l \le \frac{\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n|^2\,dx}{\lambda_n\int_\Omega e^{u_n} v_n^2\,dx}.$$

Moreover, using (3.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n|^2\,dx = \int_\Omega |\nabla\big(\xi_n u_n - s_n^1 v_n^1 - \cdots - s_n^{k-1}v_n^{k-1}\big)|^2\,dx \qquad (3.7)\\
&= \int_\Omega |\nabla(\xi_n u_n)|^2\,dx - 2\sum_{l=1}^{k-1} s_n^l\int_\Omega \nabla(\xi_n u_n)\cdot\nabla v_n^l\,dx + \sum_{l=1}^{k-1}\left(s_n^l\right)^2\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n^l|^2\,dx\\
&= \int_\Omega |\nabla(\xi_n u_n)|^2\,dx - \sum_{l=1}^{k-1}\left(s_n^l\right)^2\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n^l|^2\,dx.
\end{aligned}$$

By (3.6) and Proposition 2.20 we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(s_n^l\right)^2\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n^l|^2\,dx\\
&= \left(-\frac{2c_i^l}{\|\mathfrak{c}^l\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^m}}\log\lambda_n + o(\log\lambda_n)\right)^2\left(-\frac{4\pi}{\log\lambda_n}\|\mathfrak{c}^l\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^m} + o\left(\frac{1}{\log\lambda_n}\right)\right)\\
&= -\frac{16\pi(c_i^l)^2}{\|\mathfrak{c}^l\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^m}}\log\lambda_n + o(\log\lambda_n).
\end{aligned}$$

Then (3.7) becomes, using (3.2)

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n|^2\,dx = -16\pi\left\{1-\sum_{l=1}^{k-1}\frac{(c_i^l)^2}{\|\mathfrak{c}^l\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^m}}\right\}\log\lambda_n + o(\log\lambda_n). \tag{3.8}$$

Next, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_n\int_\Omega e^{u_n}v_n^2\,dx &= \lambda_n\int_\Omega e^{u_n}\xi_n^2u_n^2\,dx - 2\sum_{l=1}^{k-1}\lambda_n s_n^l\int_\Omega e^{u_n}\xi_n u_n v_n^l\,dx\\ &\quad+\sum_{l,l'=1}^{k-1}\lambda_n s_n^l s_n^{l'}\int_\Omega e^{u_n}v_n^l v_n^{l'}\,dx. \end{aligned}\tag{3.9}$$

Here we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{l=1}^{k-1}\lambda_n s_n^l\int_\Omega e^{u_n}\xi_n u_n v_n^l dx &= -\sum_{l=1}^{k-1}s_n^l\int_\Omega\Delta\left(\frac{v_n^l}{\mu_n^l}\right)\xi_n u_n dx\\ &=\sum_{l=1}^{k-1}\frac{s_n^l}{\mu_n^l}\int_\Omega\nabla v_n^l\cdot\nabla(\xi_n u_n)dx=\sum_{l=1}^{k-1}\frac{(s_n^l)^2}{\mu_n^l}\int_\Omega|\nabla v_n^l|^2dx,\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{l,l'=1}^{k-1}\lambda_n s_n^l s_n^{l'}\int_\Omega e^{u_n}v_n^l v_n^{l'}\,dx &= -\sum_{l,l'=1}^{k-1}\frac{s_n^l s_n^{l'}}{\mu_n^l}\int_\Omega\Delta v_n^l\cdot v_n^{l'}\,dx\\ &=\sum_{l,l'=1}^{k-1}\frac{s_n^l s_n^{l'}}{\mu_n^l}\int_\Omega\nabla v_n^l\cdot\nabla v_n^{l'}\,dx=\sum_{l=1}^{k-1}\frac{(s_n^l)^2}{\mu_n^l}\int_\Omega|\nabla v_n^l|^2\,dx,\end{aligned}$$

using the assumption (2.41). Therefore, it holds that

$$\lambda_n\int_\Omega e^{u_n}v_n^2\,dx = \lambda_n\int_\Omega e^{u_n}\xi_n^2u_n^2\,dx-\sum_{l=1}^{k-1}\frac{(s_n^l)^2}{\mu_n^l}\int_\Omega|\nabla v_n^l|^2\,dx. \tag{3.10}$$

It holds also that

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{(s_n^l)^2}{\mu_n^l}\int_\Omega|\nabla v_n^l|^2\,dx\\ &=\frac{\left\{-\frac{2c_i^l}{\|\mathfrak{c}^l\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^m}}\log\lambda_n+o(\log\lambda_n)\right\}^2}{-\frac{1}{2\log\lambda_n}+o\left(\frac{1}{\log\lambda_n}\right)}\left\{-\frac{4\pi}{\log\lambda_n}\|\mathfrak{c}^l\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^m}+o\left(\frac{1}{\log\lambda_n}\right)\right\}\\ &=\frac{32\pi(c_i^l)^2}{\|\mathfrak{c}^l\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^m}}(\log\lambda_n)^2+o\left((\log\lambda_n)^2\right).\end{aligned}$$

Then (3.10) becomes, by (3.3)

$$\lambda_n\int_\Omega e^{u_n}v_n^2\,dx = 32\pi\left\{1-\sum_{l=1}^{k-1}\frac{(c_i^l)^2}{\|\mathfrak{c}^l\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^m}}\right\}(\log\lambda_n)^2+o\left((\log\lambda_n)^2\right). \tag{3.11}$$

Here we choose $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ satisfying

$$e_i = (0, \dots, 1, 0, \dots, 0) \notin \mathfrak{C}(k-1) \tag{3.12}$$

where

$$\mathfrak{C}(k-1) := \operatorname{span}\{\mathfrak{c}^1, \dots, \mathfrak{c}^{k-1}\}.$$

This is possible because $\mathfrak{C}(k-1)$ is a $(k-1)$-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{R}^m = \operatorname{span}\{e_1, \dots, e_m\}$ (see Proposition 2.20) and $m-(k-1) \geq 1$ by $k \leq m$. Then, denoting by $\operatorname{proj}_S v$ the projection of the vector v on a subspace S of $\mathbb{R}^m$, we have, by (3.12), $\operatorname{proj}_{\mathfrak{C}(k-1)^\perp} e_i \neq 0$. Hence it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 <& |\operatorname{proj}_{\mathfrak{C}(k-1)^\perp} e_i|^2 = |e_i|^2 - |\operatorname{proj}_{\mathfrak{C}(k-1)} e_i|^2 \\ &= 1 - \left\{ \sqrt{\sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \left(e_i \cdot \frac{\mathfrak{c}^l}{\|\mathfrak{c}^l\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}} \right)^2} \right\}^2 = 1 - \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \frac{(c_i^l)^2}{\|\mathfrak{c}^l\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^m}} \end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

which implies, by (3.8) and (3.11),

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \mu_n^k \leq& \frac{-16\pi \left\{ 1 - \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \frac{(c_i^l)^2}{\|\mathfrak{c}^l\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^m}} \right\} \log \lambda_n + o(\log \lambda_n)}{32\pi \left\{ 1 - \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} \frac{(c_i^l)^2}{\|\mathfrak{c}^l\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^m}} \right\} (\log \lambda_n)^2 + o\left((\log \lambda_n)^2 \right)} \\ =& -\frac{1}{2 \log \lambda_n} + o\left(\frac{1}{\log \lambda_n} \right) \to 0. \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark 3.4. Propositions 3.3 and 2.13 imply (1.9).

3.2 Estimates of $\mu_n^{m+1}, \dots, \mu_n^{3m}$

Similarly to Section 3.1 we start by considering μ_n^k for $k = m+1$.

Proposition 3.5. *The $m+1$-th eigenvalue μ_n^{m+1} of* (1.6) *satisfies*

$$0 \leq \mu_n^{m+1} \leq 1 + O(\lambda_n) \quad \textit{as } n \to \infty.$$

Proof. We take the cut-off function ξ_n defined by (3.1) and put

$$v_n := \xi_n \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha} - s_n^1 v_n^1 - \cdots - s_n^m v_n^m$$

with

$$s_n^l := \frac{\int_\Omega \nabla \left(\xi_n \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha} \right) \cdot \nabla v_n^l \, dx}{\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n^l|^2 \, dx}, \quad l = 1, \cdots, m.$$

Then it follows that $v_n \perp \mathrm{span}\{v_n^1, \dots, v_n^m\}$.

Claim: It holds that

$$s_n^l = o(1) \quad \text{as } n \to +\infty. \tag{3.14}$$

for $l = 1, \dots, m$.

Proof of the Claim. By (1.6) we have

$$\int_\Omega \nabla\left(\xi_n \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha}\right) \cdot \nabla v_n^l \, dx = -\int_\Omega \xi_n \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha} \Delta v_n^l \, dx = \mu_n^l \lambda_n \int_\Omega e^{u_n} v_n^l \xi_n \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha} \, dx$$
$$= \mu_n^l \lambda_n \int_{B_R(x_{i,n})} e^{u_n} v_n^l \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha} \, dx + o(\mu_n^l).$$

It holds that, similarly to the proof of Proposition 2.19,

$$\begin{aligned} O(\mu_n^l) &= \int_{\partial B_R(x_{i,n})} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu}\left(\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha}\right) \cdot v_n^l - \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha} \frac{\partial}{\partial \nu} v_n^l \right\} \qquad \text{by (2.21)} \\ &= \int_{B_R(x_{i,n})} \left\{ \Delta\left(\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha}\right) \cdot v_n^l - \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha} \Delta v_n^l \right\} \\ &= \int_{B_R(x_{i,n})} \left\{ -\lambda_n e^{u_n} \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha} v_n^l + \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha} \lambda_n \mu_n^l e^{u_n} v_n^l \right\} \\ &= (\mu_n^l - 1) \int_{B_R(x_{i,n})} \lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n^l \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\int_{B_R(x_{i,n})} \lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n^l \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha} = \frac{O(\mu_n^l)}{\mu_n^l - 1} = O(\mu_n^l)$$

since $\mu_n^l \longrightarrow 0$ for any $l = 1, \dots, m$. Consequently, we obtain, by $i)$ of Proposition 2.20,

$$s_n^l = -\frac{O\left((\mu_n^l)^2\right) + o(\mu_n^l)}{\mu_n^l \left\{8\pi \|\mathfrak{c}^l\|_{\mathbb{R}^m}^2 + o(1)\right\}} = O(\mu_n^l) = o(1) \quad \text{by } \|\mathfrak{c}^l\|_{\mathbb{R}^m} \neq 0.$$

□

It holds that

$$0 \le \mu_n^{m+1} \le \frac{\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n|^2 \, dx}{\lambda_n \int_\Omega e^{u_n} v_n^2 \, dx}.$$

Then, arguing as in (3.7), from (2.42) and (3.14), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_n \int_\Omega e^{u_n} v_n^2 \, dx &= \lambda_n \int_\Omega e^{u_n} \left(\xi_n \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha}\right)^2 dx - \sum_{l=1}^m \frac{(s_n^l)^2}{\mu_n^l} \int_\Omega |\nabla v_n^l|^2 \, dx \\ &= \int_{B_R(x_{i,n})} \lambda_n e^{u_n} \left(\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha}\right)^2 dx + o(1). \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

Then it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n|^2\,dx &= \int_\Omega \left|\nabla\left(\xi_n \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha}\right)\right|^2 dx - \sum_{l=1}^m \left(s_n^l\right)^2 \int_\Omega |\nabla v_n^l|^2\,dx \\ &= \int_{B_R(x_{i,n})} \left|\nabla\left(\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha}\right)\right|^2 dx + O(1) \\ &= \int_{B_R(x_{i,n})} \lambda_n e^{u_n}\left(\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha}\right)^2 dx + O(1) \qquad \text{by (3.15)} \\ &= \int_\Omega \lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n^2\,dx + O(1).\end{aligned}$$

Here we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\lambda_n \int_{B_R(x_{i,n})} e^{u_n}\left(\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha}\right)^2 dx = \int_{B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{i,n}}}(0)} e^{\tilde{u}_{i,n}} \frac{1}{\delta_{i,n}^2}\left(\frac{\partial \widetilde{u}_{i,n}}{\partial \widetilde{x}_\alpha}\right)^2 d\widetilde{x} \\ &= \frac{1}{d_i^2\lambda_n}\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U U_\alpha^2 + o(1)\right) = \frac{4\pi}{3d_i^2\lambda_n}\Big(1+o(1)\Big).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it holds that, by (3.15)

$$\begin{aligned}0 \le \mu_n^{m+1} \le \frac{\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n|^2\,dx}{\lambda_n \int_\Omega e^{u_n} v_n^2\,dx} &= \frac{\lambda_n \int_\Omega e^{u_n} v_n^2\,dx + O(1)}{\lambda_n \int_\Omega e^{u_n} v_n^2\,dx} = 1 + \frac{O(1)}{\lambda_n \int_{B_R(x_{i,n})} e^{u_n}\left(\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha}\right)^2 + o(1)} \\ &= 1 + \frac{O(1)}{\frac{4\pi}{3d_i^2\lambda_n}\Big(1+o(1)\Big) + o(1)} = 1 + O(\lambda_n)\end{aligned}$$

since $d_i \neq 0$. □

Proposition 3.6. *We have* $\mu_\infty^{m+1} = 1$ *and there exists an eigenvalue* $\widetilde{\eta}^{m+1}$ *of the matrix* $D\{\mathrm{Hess} H^m(\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m)\}D$ *satisfying*

$$\mu_n^{m+1} = 1 - 48\pi\widetilde{\eta}^{m+1}\lambda_n + o(\lambda_n).$$

Proof. First we show that $\mu_\infty^{m+1} < 1$ is impossible. In fact, if $\mu_\infty^{m+1} < 1$ by Corollary 2.12 we have that $\mu_\infty^{m+1} = 0$. Proposition 2.20 implies the existence of $\mathfrak{c}^{m+1} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ such that

$$(V_1^{m+1}, \cdots, V_m^{m+1}) = \mathfrak{c}^{m+1} \neq 0$$

and

$$\mathfrak{c}^l \cdot \mathfrak{c}^{m+1} = 0 \quad \text{for every } l \in \{1, \cdots, m\}.$$

This is impossible because $\mathrm{span}\{\mathfrak{c}^1, \cdots, \mathfrak{c}^m\} = \mathbb{R}^m$. Therefore, by Proposition 3.5, we derive that $\mu_\infty^{m+1} = 1$, and then Proposition 2.19 gives the claim. □

Proposition 3.7. *It holds that*

$$0 \le \mu_n^k \le 1 + O(\lambda_n) \quad \textit{for } k = m+2, \cdots, 3m. \tag{3.16}$$

Proof. We prove (3.16) by induction. Let us assume that (3.16) holds for $m+1 \le l \le k-1$. So, by Proposition 2.19, we have

$$\mu_n^l = 1 - 48\pi\widetilde{\eta}^l\lambda_n + o(\lambda_n) \tag{3.17}$$

for $m+1 \le l \le k-1$, where $\widetilde{\eta}^l$ is an eigenvalue of the matrix $D\mathrm{Hess}H^m(k_1, \dots, k_m)D$. Then, from Proposition 2.17, it follows that $\mathfrak{b}^l = \mathbf{0}$, for $m+1 \le l \le k-1$, and so

$$\widetilde{v}_{i,n}^l \to a_i^l \cdot \nabla U \qquad \text{in } C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2). \tag{3.18}$$

Now we take the cut-off function ξ_n defined in (3.1) and let

$$v_n := \xi_n \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha} - s_n^1 v_n^1 - \cdots - s_n^{k-1} v_n^{k-1}$$

with

$$s_n^l := \frac{\int_\Omega \nabla\left(\xi_n \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha}\right) \cdot \nabla v_n^l \, dx}{\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n^l|^2 \, dx}.$$

Here the indices $i \in \{1, \cdots, m\}$ and $\alpha \in \{1, 2\}$ will be chosen later. In any case it follows that $v_n \perp \mathrm{span}\{v_n^1, \dots, v_n^{k-1}\}$. By Proposition 3.5 we also have $s_n^l = o(1)$ for $1 \le l \le m$. Then we have the following

Claim: It holds that

$$s_n^l = \left(\frac{a_{i,\alpha}^l}{d_i \|\mathfrak{a}^l\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^{2m}}} + o(1)\right)\frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}} \qquad \text{as } n \to \infty \tag{3.19}$$

for $l = m+1, \dots, k-1$.

Proof of the Claim. We have

$$\int_\Omega \nabla\left(\xi_n \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha}\right) \cdot \nabla v_n^l \, dx = \mu_n^l \lambda_n \int_\Omega e^{u_n} v_n^l \xi_n \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha} \, dx$$
$$= \mu_n^l \lambda_n \int_{B_R(x_{i,n})} e^{u_n} v_n^l \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha} \, dx + o\,(1)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{B_R(x_{i,n})} \lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n^l \left(\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha}\right) &= \frac{1}{\delta_{i,n}} \int_{B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{i,n}}}(0)} e^{\widetilde{u}_{i,n}} \left(\frac{\partial \widetilde{u}_{i,n}}{\partial \widetilde{x}_\alpha}\right) \widetilde{v}_{i,n}^l \\ &= \frac{1}{\delta_{i,n}} \left\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U U_\alpha \left(\boldsymbol{a}_i^l \cdot \nabla U\right) + o(1) \right\} \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}} \left(\frac{4\pi}{3} \frac{a_{i,\alpha}^l}{d_i} + o(1) \right).\end{aligned}$$

Then $iii)$ of Proposition 2.20 implies

$$s_n^l = \frac{\frac{\mu_n^l}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}}\left(\frac{4\pi}{3}\frac{a_{i,\alpha}^l}{d_i} + o(1)\right) + o\left(1\right)}{\frac{4\pi}{3}\|\mathfrak{a}^l\|_{\mathbb{R}^{2m}}^2 + o\left(1\right)} = \left(\frac{a_{i,\alpha}^l}{d_i\|\mathfrak{a}^l\|_{\mathbb{R}^{2m}}^2} + o(1)\right)\frac{1}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

□

It holds that

$$0 \leq \mu_n^k \leq \frac{\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n|^2\, dx}{\lambda_n \int_\Omega e^{u_n} v_n^2\, dx}.$$

Here we have, by (3.15),

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Omega \lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n^2 dx &= \int_\Omega \lambda_n e^{u_n}\left(\xi_n \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha}\right)^2 dx - \sum_{l=1}^{k-1}\frac{\left(s_n^l\right)^2}{\mu_n^l}\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n^l|^2\, dx \\
&= \int_{B_R(x_{i,n})} \lambda_n e^{u_n}\left(\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha}\right)^2 dx + o(1) - \sum_{l=m+1}^{k-1}\frac{\left(s_n^l\right)^2}{\mu_n^l}\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n^l|^2\, dx.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, similarly to the case $k = m+1$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n|^2\, dx = \int_\Omega \left|\nabla\left(\xi_n \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha}\right)\right|^2 dx - \sum_{l=1}^{k-1}\left(s_n^l\right)^2\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n^l|^2\, dx \\
&= \int_\Omega \left|\nabla\left(\xi_n \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha}\right)\right|^2 dx - \sum_{l=1}^{m}\left(s_n^l\right)^2\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n^l|^2\, dx - \sum_{l=m+1}^{k-1}\left(s_n^l\right)^2\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n^l|^2\, dx \\
&= \int_{B_R(x_{i,n})} \lambda_n e^{u_n}\left(\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha}\right)^2 dx + O(1) - \sum_{l=m+1}^{k-1}\left(s_n^l\right)^2\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n^l|^2\, dx \\
&= \int_\Omega \lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n^2 dx + O(1) + \sum_{l=m+1}^{k-1}\frac{1-\mu_n^l}{\mu_n^l}\left(s_n^l\right)^2\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n^l|^2\, dx \text{ by (3.18)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we get, from $iii)$ of Proposition 2.20, (3.17) and (3.19)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{l=m+1}^{k-1}\frac{1-\mu_n^l}{\mu_n^l}\left(s_n^l\right)^2\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n^l|^2\, dx \\
&\qquad = O(\lambda_n)\cdot\left(\frac{a_{i,\alpha}^l}{d_i\|\mathfrak{a}^l\|_{\mathbb{R}^{2m}}^2} + o(1)\right)^2\frac{1}{\lambda_n}\cdot O(1) = O(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently it holds that

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n|^2\, dx = \int_\Omega \lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n^2 dx + O(1). \tag{3.20}$$

On the other hand, by (3.19), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\int_\Omega \lambda_n e^{u_n} v_n^2 dx &= \int_{B_R(x_{i,n})} \lambda_n e^{u_n} \left(\frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha}\right)^2 dx + o(1) - \sum_{l=m+1}^{k-1} \frac{\left(s_n^l\right)^2}{\mu_n^l} \int_\Omega |\nabla v_n^l|^2\, dx \\ &= \frac{4\pi}{3d_i^2\lambda_n}(1+o(1)) - \sum_{l=m+1}^{k-1}\left(\frac{a_{i,\alpha}^l}{d_i\|\mathfrak{a}^l\|_{\mathbb{R}^{2m}}^2} + o(1)\right)^2 \frac{1}{\lambda_n} \\ &\qquad \times \left\{\frac{4\pi}{3}\|\mathfrak{a}^l\|_{\mathbb{R}^{2m}}^2 + o\,(1)\right\} + o(1) \\ &= \frac{4\pi}{3d_i^2\lambda_n}\left\{\left(1 - \sum_{l=m+1}^{k-1}\frac{(a_{i,\alpha}^l)^2}{\|\mathfrak{a}^l\|_{\mathbb{R}^{2m}}^2}\right) + o(1)\right\} + o(1). \end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

Let $\{e_{1,1}, e_{1,2}, \dots, e_{m,1}, e_{m,2}\}$ be the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^{2m}$ and choose $(i,\alpha) \in \{1,\dots,m\} \times \{1,2\}$ satisfying

$$e_{i,\alpha} \notin \mathfrak{A}(k-1) := \text{span}\{\boldsymbol{a}^{m+1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{a}^{k-1}\}. \tag{3.22}$$

Since $\mathfrak{A}(k-1)$ is a $(k-m-1)$-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{2m}$ (see Proposition 2.20) and observing that $k \le 3m$ implies that $2m-(k-m-1) \ge 1$, we have that there exists a pair (i,α) satisfying (3.22). Then (3.22) implies that $\text{proj}_{\mathfrak{A}(k-1)^\perp} e_{i,\alpha} \neq 0$, and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}|\text{proj}_{\mathfrak{A}(k-1)^\perp} e_{i,\alpha}|^2 &= |e_{i,\alpha}|^2 - |\text{proj}_{\mathfrak{A}(k-1)} e_{i,\alpha}|^2 \\ &= 1 - \left\{\sqrt{\sum_{l=m+1}^{k-1}\left(e_{i,\alpha}\cdot\frac{\mathfrak{a}^l}{\|\mathfrak{a}^l\|_{\mathbb{R}^{2m}}}\right)^2}\right\}^2 = 1 - \sum_{l=m+1}^{k-1}\frac{(a_{i,\alpha}^l)^2}{\|\mathfrak{a}^l\|_{\mathbb{R}^{2m}}^2} > 0.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, it follows that, by (3.20) and (3.21)

$$\begin{aligned}0 \le \mu_n^k &\le \frac{\int_\Omega |\nabla v_n|^2\, dx}{\lambda_n \int_\Omega e^{u_n} v_n^2\, dx} = \frac{\lambda_n \int_\Omega e^{u_n} v_n^2\, dx + O(1)}{\lambda_n \int_\Omega e^{u_n} v_n^2\, dx} \\ &= 1 + \frac{O(1)}{\frac{4\pi}{3d_i^2\lambda_n}\left\{\left(1 - \sum_{l=m+1}^{k-1}\frac{(a_{i,\alpha}^l)^2}{\|\mathfrak{a}^l\|_{\mathbb{R}^{2m}}^2}\right) + o(1)\right\} + o(1)} \\ &= 1 + O(\lambda_n)\end{aligned}$$

and the proof is complete. □

4 Proof of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Propositions 3.7 and 2.19 imply

$$\mu_n^k = 1 - 48\pi\widetilde{\eta}^k\lambda_n + o(\lambda_n) \tag{4.1}$$

for $m+1 \leq k \leq 3m$, where $\widetilde{\eta}^k$ is an eigenvalue of $D\mathrm{Hess}(H^m)D$. Then, from Proposition 2.17, it follows that $\mathfrak{b}^k = \mathbf{0}$ for $m+1 \leq k \leq 3m$. Let $\mu_n^k \longrightarrow 1$ with $k \geq 3m+1$. Then we have $\mathfrak{b}^k \neq 0$ because $iv)$ of Proposition 2.20 implies that $(\mathfrak{a}^k, \mathfrak{b}^k) \in \mathbb{R}^{3m}$ is orthogonal to the $2m$-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{R}^{3m}$ spanned by $(\mathfrak{a}^{m+1}, \mathbf{0}), \cdots, (\mathfrak{a}^{3m}, \mathbf{0})$. Hence we obtain

$$\mu_n^k = 1 - \frac{3}{2}\frac{1}{\log \lambda_n} + o\left(\frac{1}{\log \lambda_n}\right) > 1 \quad \text{for } n \gg 1.$$

by Proposition 2.17. Thus, the calculation of the (augmented) Morse index of u_n is reduced to study μ_m^k for $m+1 \leq k \leq 3m$ because $\mu_\infty^k = 0$ for $1 \leq k \leq m$.

Since

$$\mu_n^{m+1} \leq \cdots \leq \mu_n^{3m}$$

we have

$$\widetilde{\eta}^{m+1} \geq \cdots \geq \widetilde{\eta}^{3m}.$$

Therefore, $\widetilde{\eta}^k$ is the $\{2m-(k-m)+1\}$-th eigenvalue $\eta^{2m-(k-m)+1}$ of $D(\mathrm{Hess}H^m)D$.

As we noticed in Section 1, the sign of the l-th eigenvalue of

$$D\{\mathrm{Hess}\, H^m(\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m)\}D$$

and that of $\mathrm{Hess}\, H^m(\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m)$ is the same (see Lemma B.1). It is easy to see that the $\{2m-(k-m)+1\}$-th eigenvalue of $D(\mathrm{Hess}H^m)D$ is nothing but the $(k-m)$-th eigenvalue of $D\{\mathrm{Hess}\,(-H^m(\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m)\}D$. Finally, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{ind}_M\{-H^m(\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m)\} &= \#\{k \in \mathbb{N}\,;\, \eta^k > 0\},\\ \mathrm{ind}_M^*\{-H^m(\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_m)\} &= \#\{k \in \mathbb{N}\,;\, \eta^k \geq 0\}.\end{aligned}$$

Theorem 1.1 now follows from (4.1). □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. From Proposition 2.13 and Proposition 3.3 we get (1.9). (1.10) follows by Proposition 3.7 and Proposition 2.19. Finally (1.11) follows by Proposition 2.17 and Remark 2.18. □

A Computation of integrals

Lemma A.1. *Let* U *be as defined in* (2.6), $U_\alpha = \frac{\partial U}{\partial x_\alpha}$, *and* $\overline{U} = x \cdot \nabla U + 2$. *Then it holds that*

$$\begin{gathered}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U\, dx = 8\pi, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U U\, dx = -16\pi, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U U_\alpha\, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U \overline{U}\, dx = 0,\\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U U^2\, dx = 64\pi, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U U U_\alpha\, dx = 0, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U U \overline{U}\, dx = 16\pi,\\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U U_\alpha U_\beta\, dx = \frac{4\pi}{3}\delta_{\alpha\beta}, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U U_\alpha \overline{U}\, dx = 0, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^U \overline{U}^2\, dx = \frac{32\pi}{3}.\end{gathered}$$

The proof of the above formulae is elementary.

Proposition A.2. *It holds that*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{1}{|\widetilde{x}-\widetilde{y}|} \frac{1}{\left(1+\frac{|\widetilde{y}|^2}{8}\right)^2} d\widetilde{y} \le \frac{C}{1+|\widetilde{x}|}, \quad \forall \widetilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{A.1}$$

Proof. We divide the proof into two cases.

Case 1: For $|\widetilde{x}| \le 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{1}{|\widetilde{x}-\widetilde{y}|} \frac{1}{\left(1+\frac{|\widetilde{y}|^2}{8}\right)^2} d\widetilde{y} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_1(\widetilde{x})} + \int_{B_1(\widetilde{x})} \\
&\le \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{d\widetilde{y}}{\left(1+\frac{|\widetilde{y}|^2}{8}\right)^2} + \int_{B_1(\widetilde{x})} \frac{d\widetilde{y}}{|\widetilde{x}-\widetilde{y}|} = C \le \frac{2C}{1+|\widetilde{x}|}.
\end{aligned}$$

Case 2: For $|\widetilde{x}| \ge 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{1}{|\widetilde{x}-\widetilde{y}|} \frac{1}{\left(1+\frac{|\widetilde{y}|^2}{8}\right)^2} d\widetilde{y} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_{\frac{|\widetilde{x}|}{2}}(\widetilde{x})} + \int_{B_{\frac{|\widetilde{x}|}{2}}(\widetilde{x})} \\
&\le \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus B_{\frac{|\widetilde{x}|}{2}}(\widetilde{x})} \frac{1}{\frac{|\widetilde{x}|}{2}} \cdot \frac{1}{\left(1+\frac{|\widetilde{y}|^2}{8}\right)^2} d\widetilde{y} + \int_{B_{\frac{|\widetilde{x}|}{2}}(\widetilde{x})} \frac{1}{|\widetilde{x}-\widetilde{y}|} \cdot \frac{1}{\left\{1+\frac{1}{8}\left(\frac{|\widetilde{x}|}{2}\right)^2\right\}^2} d\widetilde{y} \\
&\le \frac{16\pi}{|\widetilde{x}|} + \frac{1}{\left(1+\frac{|\widetilde{x}|^2}{32}\right)^2} \int_{B_{\frac{|\widetilde{x}|}{2}}(0)} \frac{d\widetilde{y}}{|\widetilde{y}|} \le \frac{16\pi}{|\widetilde{x}|} + \frac{1024\pi}{|\widetilde{x}|^3} \le \frac{1040\pi}{|\widetilde{x}|},
\end{aligned}$$

since $|\widetilde{x}| \ge 1$. ☐

This estimate is a refinement of the one used in [GG09, Lemma A.1].

Lemma A.3. *There exists a constant C independent of n and j satisfying*

$$\left|\frac{\partial \widetilde{u}_{j,n}}{\partial \widetilde{x}_\alpha}\right| \le \frac{C}{1+|\widetilde{x}|} \quad \textit{in } B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{j,n}}}(0).$$

Proof. First, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial u_n(x)}{\partial x_\alpha} &= \int_\Omega G_{x_\alpha}(x,y) \lambda_n e^{u_n} dy \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^m \int_{B_R(x_{i,n})} G_{x_\alpha}(x,y) \lambda_n e^{u_n} dy + \int_{\Omega \setminus \cup_{i=1}^m B_R(x_{i,n})} G_{x_\alpha}(x,y) \lambda_n e^{u_n} dy.
\end{aligned}$$

Here it holds that

$$\left| \int_{\Omega \setminus \cup_{i=1}^m B_R(x_{i,n})} G_{x_\alpha}(x,y)\lambda_n e^{u_n} dy \right| \leq O(\lambda_n) \int_\Omega |G_{x_\alpha}(x,y)|\, dy = O(\lambda_n)$$

and also, for $i \neq j$, that

$$\int_{B_R(x_{i,n})} G_{x_\alpha}(x,y)\lambda_n e^{u_n} dy = O(1) \quad \text{in } B_R\left(x_{j,n}\right).$$

If $i = j$, on the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} G_{x_\alpha}(x,y)\lambda_n e^{u_n} dy \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} \frac{(x-y)_\alpha}{|x-y|^2} \lambda_n e^{u_n} dy + \int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} K_{x_\alpha}(x,y)\lambda_n e^{u_n} dy \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\int_{B_R(x_{j,n})} K_{x_\alpha}(x,y)\lambda_n e^{u_n} dy = 8\pi K_{x_\alpha}(x,\kappa_j) + o(1) = O(1)$$

for $x \in B_R\left(x_{j,n}\right)$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \widetilde{u}_{j,n}}{\partial \widetilde{x}_\alpha} &= \delta_{j,n} \frac{\partial u_n}{\partial x_\alpha}(\delta_{j,n}\widetilde{x} + x_{j,n}) \\ &= \delta_{j,n} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{j,n}}}(0)} \frac{\delta_{j,n}(\widetilde{x}-\widetilde{y})_\alpha}{\delta_{j,n}^2 |\widetilde{x}-\widetilde{y}|^2} e^{\widetilde{u}_{j,n}} d\widetilde{y} + O(1) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and consequently,

$$\left| \frac{\partial \widetilde{u}_{j,n}}{\partial \widetilde{x}_\alpha} \right| \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{j,n}}}(0)} \frac{1}{|\widetilde{x}-\widetilde{y}|} e^{\widetilde{u}_{j,n}} d\widetilde{y} + O(\delta_{j,n}).$$

Here we may assume

$$O(\delta_{j,n}) \leq \frac{C}{1+|\widetilde{x}|}$$

with some $C > 0$ by $\widetilde{x} \in B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{j,n}}}(0)$. We have also

$$\int_{B_{\frac{R}{\delta_{j,n}}}(0)} \frac{1}{|\widetilde{x}-\widetilde{y}|} e^{\widetilde{u}_{j,n}} d\widetilde{y} \leq C \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \frac{1}{|\widetilde{x}-\widetilde{y}|} \frac{1}{\left(1+\frac{|\widetilde{y}|^2}{8}\right)^2} d\widetilde{y}$$

with $C > 0$ by (2.7). Therefore, the lemma follows from (A.1). □

B A linear algebra lemma

Lemma B.1. *For every real symmetric $N \times N$ matrix H and a real diagonal matrix $D = \mathrm{diag}[d_1, \cdots, d_N]$ with $d_j \neq 0$ for every $j = 1, \cdots, N$, let us denote by Λ^k and $\widetilde{\Lambda}^k$ the k-th eigenvalue of H and DHD. Then the sign of Λ^k and $\widetilde{\Lambda}^k$ is the same for every $k = 1, \cdots, N$.*

Proof. From the mini-max principle it follows that

$$\widetilde{\Lambda}^k = \min_{S_k} \max_{v \in S_k \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{DHD[v]}{\|v\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^N}},$$

where S_k is a k-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{R}^N$, $\min_{S_k}$ indicates the minimum among all of the k-dimensional subspaces, and $DHD[v]$ is the quadratic form ${}^t vDHDv$.

Since D is also a symmetric matrix, it holds that

$$DHD[v] =^t vDHDv =^t v\, {}^tDHDv =^t (Dv)H(Dv) = H[Dv]$$

and

$$\max_{v \in S_k \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{DHD[v]}{\|v\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^N}} = \max_{v \in S_k \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{H[Dv]}{\|v\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^N}} = \max_{v \in DS_k \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{H[v]}{\|D^{-1}v\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^N}}.$$

Here we have

$$\frac{\|v\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^N}}{\max_{1 \le j \le N} d_j^2} \le \|D^{-1}v\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^N} \le \frac{\|v\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^N}}{\min_{1 \le j \le N} d_j^2}.$$

Therefore, it holds that

$$\min_{1 \le j \le N} d_j^2 \max_{v \in DS_k \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{H[v]}{\|v\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^N}} \le \max_{v \in DS_k \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{H[v]}{\|D^{-1}v\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^N}} \le \max_{1 \le j \le N} d_j^2 \max_{v \in DS_k \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{H[v]}{\|v\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^N}},$$

provided that $H[v]$ take a non-negative value, that is, the k-th eigenvalue $\Lambda^k \ge 0$. Consequently, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{1 \le j \le N} d_j^2 \min_{S_k} \max_{v \in S_k \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{H[v]}{\|v\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^N}} &\le \min_{S_k} \max_{v \in DS_k \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{H[v]}{\|D^{-1}v\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^N}} \\ &\le \max_{1 \le j \le N} d_j^2 \min_{S_k} \max_{v \in S_k \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}} \frac{H[v]}{\|v\|^2_{\mathbb{R}^N}}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\Lambda^k \min_{1 \le j \le N} d_j^2 \le \widetilde{\Lambda}^k \le \Lambda^k \max_{1 \le j \le N} d_j^2,$$

when $\Lambda^k \ge 0$. Similarly, we obtain

$$\Lambda^k \min_{1 \le j \le N} d_j^2 \ge \widetilde{\Lambda}^k \ge \Lambda^k \max_{1 \le j \le N} d_j^2$$

if $\Lambda^k < 0$. ☐

Acknowledgments. The first two authors are supported by M.I.U.R., project "Variational methods and nonlinear differential equations". The third and the fourth authors are supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) (No.22540231) and (B) (No. 20340034), Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

References

[BYR95] Bahri, A., Li, Y. Y., Rey, O.: On a variational problem with lack of compactness: the topological effect of the critical points at infinity. Calc. Var. PDE **36**, 67–93 (1995)

[BP98] Baraket, S., Pacard, F.: Construction of singular limits of a semilinear elliptic equation in dimension 2. Calc. Var. PDE **6**, 1–38 (1998)

[CLMP92] Caglioti, E., Lions, P.-L., Marchioro C., Pulvirenti M.: A special class of stationary flows for two-dimensional Euler equations: a statistical mechanics description. Comm. Math. Phys. **143**, 501–525 (1992)

[CLMP95] Caglioti, E., Lions, P.-L., Marchioro C., Pulvirenti M.: A special class of stationary flows for two-dimensional Euler equation: a statistical mechanics description, Part II. Comm. Math. Phys. **174**, 229–260 (1995)

[CCL03] Chang, S.-Y.A., Chen, C.-C., Lin, C.-S.: Extremal functions for a mean field equations in two dimension. In: Lectures on Partial Differential Equations, New Stud. Adv. Math. 2, Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 61–93 (2003)

[CL01] Chen, C.-C., Lin, C.-S.: On the symmetry of blowup solutions to a mean field equation. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **18**, 271–296 (2001)

[CL02] Chen, C.-C., Lin, C.-S.: Sharp estimates for solutions of multi-bubbles in compact Riemann surfaces. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **55**, 728–771 (2002)

[CL03] Chen, C.-C., Lin, C.-S.: Topological degree for a mean field equation on Riemann surfaces. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **56**, 1667–1727 (2003)

[CL91] Chen, W., Li, C.: Classification of solutions of some nonlinear elliptic equations. Duke Math. J. **63**, 615–622 (1991)

[CR75] Crandall, M.G., Rabinowitz, P.H.: Some continuation and variational methods for positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic eigenvalue problems. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **58**, 207–218 (1975)

[DKM05] del Pino, M., Kowalczyk, M., Musso, M.: Singular limits in Liouville-type equations. Calc. Var. PDE **24**, 47–81 (2005)

[ES93] Eyink, G.L., Spohn, H.: Negative-temperature states and large-scale, long-lived vortices in two-dimensional turbulence. J. Stat. Phys. **70**, 833–886 (1993)

[EGP05] Esposito, P., Grossi, M., Pistoia, A.: On the existence of blowing-up solutions for a mean field equation. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **22**, 227–257 (2005)

[GG04] Gladiali, F., Grossi, M.: Some results for the Gel'fand problem. Comm. Partial Differential Equations **29**, 1335–1364 (2004)

[GG09] Gladiali, F., Grossi, M.: On the spectrum of a nonlinear planar problem. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **26**, 728–771 (2009)

[GOS11] Grossi, M., Ohtsuka, H., Suzuki, T.: Asymptotic non-degeneracy of the multiple blow-up solutions to the Gel'fand problem in two space dimensions. Adv. Differential Equations **16**, 145–164 (2011)

[GP05] Grossi, M., Pacella, F.: On an eigenvalue problem related to the critical exponent. Math. Z. **250**, 225–256 (2005)

[GT10] Grossi, M., Takahashi, F.: Nonexistence of multi-bubble solutions to some elliptic equations on convex domains. J. Funct. Anal. **259**, 904–917 (2010)

[JM73] Joyce, G., Montgomery, D.: Negative temperature states for two-dimensional guiding-center plasma. J. Plasma Phys. **10**, 107–121 (1973)

[K93] Kiessling, M.K.H.: Statistical mechanics of classical particles with logarithmic interaction. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **46**, 27–56 (1993)

[Li99] Li, Y. Y.: Harnack type inequality: the method of moving planes. Comm. Math. Phys. **200**, 421–444 (1999)

[L07] Lin, C.-S.: An expository survey on the recent development of mean field equations. Discrete Continuous Dynamical Systems **19**, 387–410 (2007)

[MW01] Ma, L., Wei, J.: Convergence for a Liouville equation. Comment. Math. Helv. **76**, 506–514 (2001)

[MS97] Mizoguchi, N., Suzuki, T.: Equations of gas combustion: S-shaped bifurcation and mushrooms. J. Differential Equations **134**, 183–215 (1997)

[NS90] Nagasaki, K., Suzuki, T.: Asymptotic analysis for two-dimensional elliptic eigenvalues problems with exponentially dominated nonlinearities. Asymptotic Analysis **3**, 173–188 (1990)

[O12] Ohtsuka, H.: To what extent can the Hamiltonian of vortices illustrate the mean field of equilibrium vortices? RIMS Kôkyûroku **1798**, 1–17 (2012)

[O49] Onsager, L.: Statistical hydrodynamics. Suppl. Nuovo Cimento **6**, 279–287 (1949)

[PL76] Pointin, Y.B., Lundgren, T.S.: Statistical mechanics of two-dimensional vortices in a bounded container. Phys. Fluids **19**, 1459–1470 (1976)

[SU92] Suzuki, T.: Global analysis for a two-dimensional elliptic eigenvalue problem with exponential nonlinearity. Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **9**, 367–398 (1992)

[S08] Suzuki, T.: Mean Field Theories and Dual Variation. Atlantis Press, Amsterdam-Paris (2008)

[FT] Takahashi, F.: Blow up points and the Morse indices of solutions to the Liouville equation in two-dimension. Adv. Nonlinear Stud. **12** 115–122 (2012)